

DÂRSANIKA  
MAHÂ PRAVACHANA



*Jnanananda*

# DÂRSANIKA MAHÂ PRAVACHANA

दार्शनिक महा प्रवचन

BY

SWAMI JNANANANDA

WITH A FOREWORD BY

Prof. S. RADHAKRISHNAN, M.A., D. LITT.

*King George V Professor of Philosophy, University of Calcutta,*

*Vice-Chancellor, The Andhra University.*

PUBLISHED BY

N. SATYANARAYANA RAJU

AND

P. RAJAM RAJU

SRI NARASIMHA BHAVANAM,

P. O. RALANGI,

DT.-WEST GODAVARY,

INDIA.

1931.

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED  
BY  
THE PUBLISHERS



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PUBLISHERS' NOTE	... VII
FOREWORD	... IX
PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION I	... I
PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION II	... 37
SCIENCE AND RELIGION	... 85
TRANSCENDENCE	... 145

## PUBLISHERS' NOTE

In the far off ages the master seers and selfless sages of highest spiritual eminence revealed unto the posterity the nature of the universe and its laws and the nature of the Absolute-Divine by whose existence there is an existence of the relative laws that govern and the universe that is governed. Their life was a fitting vehicle of the Divine and their thought and action were in tune with the higher laws that manifest the Absolute-Divine. All this wisdom was unveiled and unfolded unto us in a fitting manner. But on account of added circumstances and occasionally cropped up causal conditions the unveiled knowledge and wisdom appears from time to time to be veiled to the view. It is in such periods that "the old order changeth yielding place to new" and it is again then that there comes a necessity for readjustment and remodeling the presentation of the very same light, culture, knowledge and wisdom in a manner

different from that of the old. There had been and there would be fitting personages endowed with clearness of vision subtlety of thought and unfathomable depth of insight, who could and who would supply the said need. At present, in this juncture when there is a warfare between the ancient culture and the modern civilization and between religion and philosophy and when the seekers after the Divine-Truth are at a loss to know the safest course to achieve the highest aim, these lectures which the *Master* delivered to His pupils and friends in Germany in a manner best suited to this age of scientific enquiry and rationalistic criticism, will, we hope, be a greater boon than a beacon-light to the storm-beaten and way-lost crew.

We take up the privilege of bringing out these invaluable lectures to publication. May this book go forth on its mission of helping all aspirants.

## FOREWORD

I am sorry that I have not been able to give this work the careful study it deserves. From a very cursory perusal of it, I feel that the author Swami Jnanananda speaks from a deeply digested experience. In so doing he is in the line of the great thinkers of India. Hinduism is not a founded religion. It does not centre round any historical individuals. Its fundamental positions depend on the insights of individuals who wrestled with the ultimate problems. The Vedas record the visions or views of the ancient seers, which reveal the immortal destiny of human individuals. To know, possess and be the spirit even in this animal frame, to convert our obscure plodding mentality into clear spiritual illumination, to transform our emotions into the measure and status of the divine, to make our actions partake of the divine creating is the end of human existence. These lectures by a student of ancient Indian wisdom who is also familiar

with modern scientific methods are based on such a view of human life, and will, I hope, be found useful to modern intellectuals.

S. RADHAKRISHNAN.

OM!  
PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION

I

Supreme Knowledge and Wisdom  
as Its Basis

*(Delivered in Dresden, Germany, Winter 1928.)*

OM!

SISTERS AND BROTHERS,

Before I begin our to-day's discourse on the Philosophical Religion let me beg to clear myself to you lest the name of the subject of our discourse might lead you to expect that I would give a general exposition of speculative philosophy and its bearings upon religion. Our to-day's subject, if it can be deemed as a system of philosophy, has nothing to do with a system of speculation for furnishing methods to carry on

elaborate and complicated arguments from assumed premises of possible possibilities or impossibilities. This subject, if it can be deemed to be an edifice of metaphysics, let me state that it has nothing to do with the theorised theory of knowledge or in the metaphysical language of Germans "Erkenntnislehre." This subject, if it can be deemed to be a system of both metaphysics and philosophy, is not to be limited to the sense of classical philosophy and authorised academical metaphysics. Nor has the subject anything to do with the religious dogmas given in the name of the accepted code of your religion and my religion. Nor does our subject constitute stories relating the pleasing and pleasurable heavens with a set of sensuous rewards or the terrifying hells with a bundle of cruel punishments. Our subject is not to chalk out the way for a code of "shall" and "shall not"



or "must" and "must not" given in the name of a particular creed or of a particular church. The subject, I say, is at once philosophy and religion, of course not in the sense of classics and academics nor in the sense of any particular church, but in a different sense, in a different understanding. This does not mean that I am revolutionary and that our subject is revolutionary in character. The subject, as a matter of fact, is not new, is not of my own speculation. It is as ancient as the history of mankind. Is it philosophy? Yes, it is philosophy inasmuch as the subject deals with a systematic study of the revelations of seers and sages which embrace the very essence of Existence. It is philosophy because it is based upon knowledge of transcendence, upon the wisdom revealed unto the wise, unto the seers and sages. Let me say that the wisdom is not a matter of mere fancy, is not a

matter of mere logical conjecture constructed and construed in this way or in that way in accordance with certain assumed premises. The wisdom is not a matter of our creation, is not a matter of our fanciful play. It is indeed a matter embracing the very nature and Essence of existence. Our subject is philosophy in so far as it deals with that wisdom in order to grasp it intellectually, I mean by common understanding and reason. Then, is it religion? Yes, it is religion in as much as it deals with that wisdom and with the ways of grasping it emotionally. It is religion because it deals with the wisdom and the methods of realizing the wisdom, the very light of Existence, the very Reality. And as the subject expounds the wisdom, the ways and the sure methods of realizing the true Essence, the divine Perfection in all, intellectually, emotionally as well as

intuitively through supersensuous intuitions, I have chosen to call it the Philosophical Religion; and it is only in that sense I request you to follow me.

Now while beginning our subject, I mean the Philosophical Religion, which, as philosophy, as I already told you, does not depend upon speculation and as religion, upon any set of social dogmas, but upon the revelations of selfless seers, upon the divine laws that govern the universe, upon the ever shining facts that were realized by sages, let me have the pleasure of telling you that those mighty revelations and the revealed eternal laws were sung in the form of hymns and that the most ancient collections of such sacred hymns are the Vedas, the grand and the sublime scriptures of the adepts, handed down to us orally from teacher to student in those far off long ages when even speech was not committed

to writing or in other words when writing was unknown. It is indeed a miracle, a matter of extreme wonder, how such a vast treasure has been preserved only through memory and heroically handed over to us as well as to the coming posterity! These scriptures, I mean the Vedas in the form in which they exist to us, on some assumed premises are conjectured to have their beginning only about 6,000 years ago, while on some other grounds are said to have existed before 20,000 years and while on altogether differently logical foundations they are believed to have an existence even before 50,000 years. Then as regards the place of origin or the place where they were first originated also different opinions have been expressed. We were told by some that they had their beginnings in the central Asiatic regions or even more probably in the Asiatic arctic regions and by some others in

the northern European regions and again by some others we were told, nay even assured that they had their origin only in the calm bowers of India. Here let me remark that these opinions and the plausible explanations given in connection with the date and the place of origin cannot be taken as facts of any trustworthiness, cannot be taken as more than mere plausible opinions because to the adepts, to the seers, *Vedas* are not books, are not simple poems or hymns composed on a particular date and at a particular place. To them, I mean to the seers, let me tell you, *Vedas* are the transcendental wisdom and knowledge relating to the infallible and eternal laws governing the universe. As a matter of fact all the laws and all the facts, both physical and super-physical, have been ever existing and they shall ever exist in some form or the other. Whether man

takes notice of them or not, whether he enunciates or defines them as such or not, the facts indeed shine in their own way. As for example, let me tell you, that the principle of gravitation and the laws of gravitation were and have been always existing. The principle of gravitation did not come with Newton. He, as a matter of fact, was not the creator. Nor was he the only person who could take notice of it. Thousands of men could utilize this principle for their practical purposes and millions could see and feel the effects even long before Newton. Of course it was Newton who enunciated the said principle in the form in which it exists to the modern empirical sciences. I say that this principle, I mean the principle of gravitation, as a principle existed even before Newton and it could have existed in the same way in which it exists now even if Newton

would not have enunciated it. Now what I mean to point out is, that as all the principles governing the universe ever exist, the wisdom and knowledge pertaining to all the principles both concrete and abstract ever exist and will be existing in their glory in the very inner nature of the subject even if they are not manifested. Supreme knowledge and wisdom cannot be in existence, cannot be in manifestation, if it were not for their existence already in the subject, for what existed not cannot be in existence. Because the supreme knowledge and wisdom were there and because they are already there in the subject they are here; and there is a possibility of their being here in their manifested form. This limitless treasure of knowledge and wisdom, whether manifested in some form or other has been ever existing, and shall be ever existing because what exists cannot come into non-

existence. Hence it is rightly declared that this treasure of knowledge and wisdom is eternal and it is this eternal knowledge and wisdom, the grand adept seers verily call *Vedas*. Let me therefore say that it is in that sense that *Vedas* are to be known as eternal. And when I say *Vedas*, I do not mean only the Vedas as they are manifested to us through the ancient seers in the form of hymns of the scriptural language of the cultured, but what I mean is that this infinite treasure of knowledge and wisdom, which ever exists in the very core of the subject and which shall be realized by them who can verily view within by discipline of self-sacrifice, renunciation, selfless love and the restraint of the subjective transformations, modifications and forms. This kind of sublime realization of the supreme knowledge and wisdom within, is what I call a revelation.



Well, the supreme knowledge and wisdom, as were manifested and were sung in the form of hymns or the Vedic hymns, were the revelations of selfless seers and adept teachers. Verily they led a pure and simple life amidst nature which provided them with their few simple wants. Unquenchable lust and greed, desire and passion could not break into their strong fortresses of contentment and satiation. Their discriminative minds were free from the passionate fevers of senseless hoardings and the encumberment of the sins of wealth and money. Our habitual complaint of want of time for the vital problems of life, often chiefly due to sport and game, was unknown to them. They did not adopt themselves to our multifarious time-killing social functions. They did not allow themselves to distractions with which the present is endangering its peace and that of the future.

The daily duties for the requisites and the requirements were fulfilled in a couple of hours in the morning and a couple in the evening. All the rest of the time they had was spent not for the idle vanities or vain glories or for easing the flesh and blood, but for looking at and adoring the nature and its grand mysteries. They were looking with amazement at the invigorating and warmth-giving glorious sun and the sunshine in the day and at the gentle, calm and charming moon and the countless diamond stars and emerald planets twinkling in the dark hair of the queen of night. Those seers listened to the super-note in the soft and gentle murmurs of the gliding rivers as well as in the constant roars of running brooks and rapid falls rushing forth from the mountain heights. They kneeled down and with rolling tears of love and ecstasy admired the long and mighty mountain chains

piercing with their snow-crowned peaks the very heavens and the gentle ripples of the lovely lakes and the dashing waves of the awe-inspiring seas. The adept masters watched the great changes in nature, one season following the other in a cyclic order. They filled their hearts with reverence looking at the noble juvenile maid of spring, who with her kindness cheered both the humble plant of the plain and the mighty forest-tree, the pastures of the rugged mountain-slopes, the even plains and the high plateaus, and with her masterly hand filled the meadows with the finest art of painting with varied hues and variegated colours. They enriched their minds looking at the hero of summer who with his heroic glances was flooding every nook and corner of the globe with warmth and light, and who creating thirst let the heavens shower to quench the thirsty earth. They be-

held with wonder and amazement the cold-blooded greedy glutton, who shooting down both the flower and the fruit, the leaf and the grass and thus making the nature bare, passed away with the time, yielding place to the silver-headed winter, which, as if for protecting the meek and the gentle earth from the merciless stormy blow of cold, kindly spread its stainless white wool of snow. All these the masters watched; and thus watching they filled up their hearts and minds with love and devotion, with the spirits of admiration and adoration. Their spirit of appreciation awakened the desire to enquire and to know the essence of this grand Existence, ever changing, ever evolving, and involving. With sincere love and desire to know they asked themselves: "What is this?" "Whence it comes?" and "Whither it goes?" "How is this changing?" "What is the changless Real in the

changeable?" These were the problems which confronted them. As a result they perceived and observed, they analysed, synthesized, and generalized. They concentrated upon the generalizations which led them to introspection; they with their introspective meditations transcended the limits of the subjective view; and they with the transcendental view realized the eternal and supreme knowledge and wisdom. Thus they had revelations and the revealed truth was manifested in the form of hymns or the Vedic hymns or the Vedas. The Vedas, the Rig, the Yajur, the Sama, and the Atharva were thus manifested and have been handed down to us and to the posterity in a miraculous way. Let me here remark that the manifested knowledge, the Vedas, are not the be-all and end-all of *Vedas*, the supreme knowledge and wisdom. *Vedas* were revealed to the Vedic seers and *Vedas* are being

revealed unto us even to-day in Their countless aspects. The subject of ours to-day, call it a subject of Philosophy and Metaphysics or that of religion and spirituality, is based not only upon the Vedas—I mean upon the revelations of the ancient Vedic seers—but also upon the revelations revealed unto me by the grace of the *Master*, the great adept seer, at whose feet I have had the privilege and fortune of sitting and drinking deep into the mysteries of the abstract and those of the Existence-Beyond. Here, what I mean to state is that the subject of our lecture is based upon the revelations and in a general and universal sense upon *Vedas*. In so far as this subject deals with the way and procedure of understanding those infallible revelations which embrace the different facts of Existence and their possibility as such in relation to one another and in their relation to the subject to which the


facts and the related facts are the seeming factors of Existence, it is philosophy, and in so far as it expounds the laws of elimination of narrowed-down limits of "I-ness" and its inherent form of the causal heterogeneity of the continuum to which time and space are the aspects from the view and thus expounds the ways of realizing the transcendental Divine-Existence, it is religion. Such being the scope and the extent of our subject, I have permitted myself to take the liberty of transgressing the common limits of school-philosophy and creed-religion and of proceeding with it in our own way and in the way of the Master-Seers.

Revelations being the realizations of *Vedas* which, as a matter of fact, are the light of Existence, the knowledge of any form of Existence, be it physical or superphysical, concrete or abstract, empirical or transcendental is realized. Often the revelations

even transcend the scope of word and thought; and of course as far as they can be produced and brought forth into the dominion of word and thought they were expressed and there is the possibility of their being expressed either in a poetic form or in a simple prose form. Verily it could have been grander and could have been more befitting to sing them to you rather than to speak over with artless speech, to arouse the tunes and wake up the notes rather than to relate and to talk over. But ah! I have not that power to set the cords to vibrate and to tune and sing those grand revelations to you. Yet I have the burning desire to serve by relating them to you. Let me therefore simply narrate, simply relate the general view of the revelations. They indeed reveal unto us the secondless transcendental divine Absolute, inaccessible both to speech and thought, the unfalsified glory of that eternal



Be-ness, the mysterious Awakenment and Its Grand Law, the dominion of the Law as the supreme consciousness, the force of the Law as the principle of Cosmic Affirmation individualized and expressed into the forms of the heterogeneous continuum the aspects of which are time and space, the extension of the Law into the dominion of the causal heterogeneity, the presentation and the reproduction of the extension of the Law as the orders of units-events and their collisions and counter-collisions as the myriad forms of psychic thoughts and feelings and the physical protons and electrons and their tempero-spatial relations as their laws of attraction and repulsion, sympathy and antipathy for the apparent or relative existence of atoms, the unfoldment of the law of atomic agglomeration and the evolution of the apparent existence in its animate and so-called inanimate forms, giving



thereby the clear view of macrocosm and microcosm or in other words the right knowledge of cosmology. The real Vedic cosmology is not a simple theory as people are sometimes apt to think and err. It is not a simple theory of atomic agglomeration. It is neither a doctrine of simple evolution, nor a created theory of simple cosmic illusion and individual nescience. It is by no means an exposition rejecting one theory and supporting the other. It is, as I said before, no theory created by some famous personality. It is knowledge and wisdom expounding the very Existence, the very Reality. In the course of my speech, if I give in connection with the revealed cosmology, an exposition of the supreme Theological Principle, Cosmic illusion and individual nescience or that of evolution and collision or that of agglomeration and manifestation, it is, not because that the revealed cosmology

has borrowed these from any one of the current theories but because all these factors are there constituting the Existence. And in so far as the current theories have any verity in themselves describing the factors of Existence, there are and there can be similarities with the revealed cosmological knowledge and wisdom, and only in so far all the current theories, losing the views of their apparent contradiction, can find out their solacing harmony in the revealed cosmology. Hence I say that the revelations, or to be definite and particular, the revealed cosmology is never in contradiction with verity even if it is derived through logical premises and inferences. As a matter of fact right inferential knowledge or knowledge manifested through right reasoning is never in contradiction with revelations. But, very often, reason has the possibility of erring or in other words has the

possibility of running into fallacies. Reason, however trained and consistent it may seem to be, is often inconsistent with the very factors of existence, because it is based upon premises derived from sense perception which have the elements of individual nescience and cosmic illusion. While revelation being an inherent transcendental view, transcending the seeds of nescience and illusion and thus embracing the very factors and facts of existence, is infallible in its character. Such is the greatness and might of revelations. Verily blessed are they who seek within and thus strive to gain revelations and thrice blessed are they to whom the supreme knowledge and wisdom manifest through revelations.

Here let me not fail to say the fact that revelations do not end with the knowledge of cosmology. *Vedas*, I mean supreme knowledge and

wisdom being infinite, any of their aspects can be revealed unto us. The revelations also manifest unto us the knowledge of the peculiar character of the principles that affect the senses, of the nature and function of the senses, of the operations of sensibility, of the relation and work of understanding and reason, of the nature of the expression of individuality and its establishment of the relations with the functions and the resultants of the functions of the senses, sensibility, understanding, and reason, of the emanation of the feelings, of the force and function of memory, of the nature and the function of volition and individual conscious will etc. giving thereby the right view of ordinary general psychology and of the knowledge of the principles of perception. Again there are revelations which reveal unto us the knowledge of the nature of the simple conscious

state, of its functions and guiding will, of the nature of subconscious state, its guiding will and its operations, of the nature of the superconscious state, its superguiding will and its supreme mission, of simple relations and functional relations of the different states of consciousness, of their being the aspects of supreme consciousness and will, and also of the nature of sensuous knowledge, of the nature of rational knowledge, of the nature of the inherent subjective forms of intuition and the inherent subjective form of knowledge, both independent of experience, of the function of the different states of consciousness upon the said inherent forms of intuition and knowledge that are absolutely independent of experience, thereby giving a right view and wisdom of higher psychology, metaphysics and transcendental philosophy.

There are also revelations revealing

unto us the wisdom of the manifestation of the universal and individual minds, of the origin of ideas, of the relation between ideas and ideas, of the laws that govern the said relations, of the intrinsic merits of the said laws, of the laws of expression of ideas as words, of the force and significance of words, of the laws of the said force and significance, of the method of entering into the force and significance of words, of the ways of their harmonization, of the possibilities of reaching the spirit of the word through the said harmony, of the scope of realizing the divine Non-word through the method of meditating upon the laws of ideas and those of the words, giving thus a clear view of philosophical grammar and logic whose essential aims are also, for realizing the Absolute through the right spirit of the word and that of right discipline of thought and reason.

I will now make a mention of one more important branch before I proceed further. Let me say that there are again revelations which reveal unto us the sublime wisdom of the Absolute, of the possibility of the apparent existence through the Absolute-Existence, of the presentation of the Cosmic Consciousness, of the principle of Universal assertion, of the pure Ego and its nature, of the nature and separation into the subjectivity and the objectivity, of the transformations, forms and forms of light inherent in the very nature of the subjectivity, of their general natures and functions in presenting the apparent manifoldness and the deceptive many-ness, of the nature of their hindrance to the supreme view, of the possibility of getting over the obstructions of the supreme view, of the methods of restraining and eliminating the transformations, modifications, forms etc.,



of the annihilation of individual nescience and the possibility of transgressing cosmic illusion, and thus of transcending the apparent in order to realize the supreme knowledge and wisdom, thus giving unto us the view of Yoga or the science of the restraint of subjective transformations, modifications, forms and forms of light etc..

I have now presented to you only that much general view of the revelations, which will doubtless suffice our purpose, because our discourse as a discourse of the Philosophical Religion, is based on the one hand upon revealed cosmology, general psychology, metaphysics, transcendental philosophy, philosophical grammar and logic, and on the other upon the systems of education of the attitudes and feelings by governing the lower sentiments and enriching the heart with the feelings of the Sublime and the Divine, on the possibilities

of the resultant subjective one-pointedness and subjective elevation, upon the system of transcendence over the ego, over the inner forms and limitations, and lastly upon the supreme realizations of the Absolute-Divine in all. It is, let me declare, in the revealed view that the apparent contradictions between the so-called philosophy and religion become meaningless. It is again in this view that the diverging diversities between philosophy and religion converge. Again it is in this grand view that empiricism and transcendentalism go hand in hand with harmony. Such are the revelations and such is their universal view.

Now while coming to the basic and fundamental point of the general view of revelations, permit me to tell you again that the most ancient Vedic seers looked at nature with wonder and amazement, with deep

love and admiration, till they were one with their objects of wonder, till thereby they lost their mean individuality and thus transcended all the limitations and finally realized the Divine-Absolute in nature. The seers verily adored the rain, thunder and lightning with unflinching love and devotion. They sung unto their glory and meditated and meditated upon them till their superconscious view could realize the Reality, the divine Essence of rain, thunder and lightning. Verily, that divine Reality, they called *Indra*. They looked at and with serene minds meditated upon the blazing fire and lo! they beheld with their supreme view the divine Reality that pervades fire as its Essence.

Again they saw the birds flying together in great numbers, in great flocks from place to place, as if they were given an impetus to move and to fly in flocks by a common will. It

was that common bond and will of the flocks of birds that the seers had meditated upon and realized the Divine in the will and the common bond as their true Essence which they called the divine *Garutman*. Thus every significant phenomenon or phenomenal object was their object of keen observation and meditation, and in each they beheld the Divine which they called by a particular name. Again the microcosm with its countless diversities, with its myriad changing functions, was a wonder of wonders to them, as it should be to every introspective mind; and upon that inner universe they meditated and realized the Divine-Self. We have thus so many names, *Indra, Agni, Varuna, Prajapati* etc. which may and even doubtlessly did bring the wrong idea that there are many divine principles or Gods, and that therefore the basic and fundamental tenet of revelations and philosophical

## PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION—I

---

religion is polytheism. It is by no means polytheism even though there are innumerable names. Nay, polytheism is never known to the view of revelations, to the philosophical religion which has abundant richness of supreme knowledge and wisdom. Polytheism had its origin not in knowledge but only in ignorance, only in those creed-religions which have evolved out of family, clan and tribal gods. In the beginning of every creed-religion, each family had its distinct god, each clan had one and each tribe had its own distinct god to serve as protection against every kind of danger, against every kind of sickness. This kind of polytheism gradually evolved into monotheism because the god of that family, or clan or tribe which gained supremacy and power over all the others, had gained the supremacy over the gods of all others and thus became the common God of all.

Only creed-religions which were originally polytheistic thus became monotheistic. Here let me again declare that the Philosophical Religion has never been polytheistic. It has but one Divine, the only Absolute-Divine, existing as the real Existence in all, in nature and in man. To supreme intuitions, to the Philosophical Religion there being but the one Reality, the only secondless Divine Existence, the said polytheism and even the so-called monotheism are absolutely meaningless. To the revealed seers, to the supreme view, rain, thunder and lightning are the divine Indra, the fire is the divine Agni and so on. Verily Indra, Agni, Varuna, nay even Garutman and the supreme Self are all different names of the one and the only Divine. They are all the one and the only absolute divine. This fact is not a new outcome. It was always in the view of revelations. It

is revealed unto us to-day and it was revealed in the same way unto the Vedic seers of the ages long gone by. Long ago when history was unknown it was sung and beautifully sung in the divinest verse :

“Ekam sad viprah bahudhavadanti ” [एकं सद्विप्राः बहुधावदन्ति]

“The one Reality, the wise call in many ways.”

Now from all this it becomes clear that the fundamental and the final truth of all revelations is the secondless Divine, the One without a second, that the only essential basis, essence and goal of life, nay of existence is the same Absolute, and that the true aim of our experience, our understanding, our study, our discipline, of our religion, philosophy and science is to manifest that Absolute, is to manifest that divine Perfection, ever shining, ever existing in Its infinite glory in all. Yes, there is

but one Divine,—ah ! how should I express—as if ever breathing breathlessly by Itself and other than That there has been nothing. There is one Absolute, therefore one existence, one Reality, therefore one life, one Perfection, therefore one humanity, and one secondless Divine, therefore one brotherhood, one harmony and one unity. Let that one Divine therefore, the unity, harmony, and peace, be the Guide of our heart and mind. Let that one Perfection be the only Light of thought, word and deed. Let that one and the only Absolute be the Law of our life. Let That be our solace and bliss in and after the so-called death ! Amen !

OM !



OM !  
PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION  
II

The Means of  
Supreme Knowledge and Wisdom

*(Delivered in Dresden, Germany, Winter 1928.)*

OM!

SISTERS AND BROTHERS,

In continuation of our discourse on the Philosophical Religion, and before proceeding on further into a more elaborate view of the subject, kindly permit me to say again that the infinite treasures of supreme knowledge and wisdom latently shining in the very core of the subject, manifest unto us in one or the other of their countless aspects. The means, I mean, the instrumentalities through which the infinite

treasures of supreme knowledge and wisdom are brought forth into manifestation are several, and each means in a way has its own purport, and has its own necessity, in calling out into manifestation one or the other of the innumerable aspects of the supreme knowledge and wisdom that expound one or the other of the concrete, and abstract manifold diversities of the apparent existence, and of the Existence-in-Itself independent of every kind of representation—of every kind of limitation. Such being the importance of the means, I say that a short treatise or a brief exposition of the said means should by no means be neglected before we ascend to the heights of the Philosophical Religion. It is even very essential at the very outset, to enquire into the possibility, the scope, the extent, the validity, and the extent of the validity of every one of the means in order to

grasp the significance, and the due extent, and to assign the right position, and the due merit to every one of the means. Such a sort of enquiry, and study saves us on the one hand from unnecessary superimpositions of undue merit upon the means, and on the other, from many misunderstandings, and misgivings that may arise as a result of the attribution of undue qualities. Our view, as a result of this study and enquiry, being free from the fetters of false limitations, shall not be dangerous or detrimental to our onward progress.

As a matter of fact, it can be remarked, and remarked with certainty, that the negligence of the right study of the means has resulted in the errors of attributing too much, and undue importance to the knowledge manifested through sense perception, and of dogmatically adhering to the tenet of entirely ignoring all the other means besides reason or

besides the so-called pure reason, and that in almost every age, more or less it is these errors that have played the greatest mischief in hindering and restricting the natural manifestation of supreme knowledge, and wisdom. These errors again are the root causes of many of the senseless disputes and controversies between the so-called classical systems. If the systems have the strength to adhere to the blunders, if they have the power to maintain their errors at all costs for showing the so-called originality, and for being designated as originally classical, let them do so. It is not our purpose to pretend extra originality nor is it our aim to be stamped with the seal of the accepted school authority. Our goal is Truth, and our view, I mean the view of the Philosophical Religion, is universal. The Truth, nothing but the Truth is the subject for the studies of the Philosophical Religion. Such being

the out-look, all its strivings, all its aspirations are directed to view the Truth from different stand-points and ultimately to realize the Truth, the Reality in its true Existence independent of all stand-points. The procedure, then, is not from falsehood to Truth but is from Truth to Truth, is from the Truth as viewed from one stand-point to the Truth as viewed from a different stand-point, and finally to the Truth—to the Absolute Reality independent of all limitations. And knowledge and wisdom are of the Reality, and are of that Truth as is apparent from one or the other or from all stand-points. Well, if through senses particular aspects of supreme knowledge are brought out, if through reason different other aspects are manifested, and if through the rest of the different means the rest of the different aspects of the supreme knowledge and wisdom are called

out into manifestation and if all these various manifestations of the said aspects—being supplementary to each other—form a harmonious union, if the harmonious unity of the manifested is the all-round view of the Real, and of the Real as it is apparent, and if this all-round view leadeth unto fullness, unto completion, and unto perfection, our aim—I mean—the aim of the Philosophical Religion is achieved. As such the Philosophical Religion looks with the senses, studies with understanding and reason, grasps the essential subjective forms of intuition and reasoning, enters the said intrinsic forms, and goes beyond the limits of these very forms, and thus realizes the Absolute. So it does not ignore any of the means. It does not deny any of the means. It studies each, it understands each, it looks at the extent of the dominion of each, and assigning the due merit and position to each,

and thus catching up the note of mysterious harmony, supplementing all, harmonizing all, and strengthening all, it fulfils its mighty purport. Such a fulfilment being its object, nay, its essential object, it does not ignore the manifestation through any of the means, and it does by no means shrink back from taking up the due and right help of each of the means even if it is banished from the annals of the school philosophy, even if it is cried down as primitive. It keeps up to its purport and works out its mission at all costs. Such is the Philosophical Religion. Such is the purport, and such is its fulfilment.

Having the privilege of grasping the spirit and the said fulfilment of the Philosophical Religion, and having undertaken the task of speaking to you of this subject, the subject of our to-day's discourse, I mean to deal with the means as they



form an essential part of the studies of the Philosophical Religion. I do not know how far I can do justice to them during this short period that is at our disposal. However, to be brief in my exposition of the means, let me first beg to state that sensuous cognition, transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition, inferential and comparative judgments, subjective inherent form of light, instinctive perception, verbal testimony, and lastly the mystic revelations are the different means through which the supreme knowledge and wisdom in different aspects are manifested unto us. The possibilities of these means are not to be imported from a foreign locality or sphere. They are not to be manufactured by some artificial methods. The possibilities are already there, and they are reproduced into actualities, I mean, into the means for manifesting the latent knowledge and wisdom as

a natural consequence of the right evolution, as a consequence of the unfoldment. Life being the be-ness of gradual evolution—life being the be-ness of the process of unfoldment—the different means for the manifestation of the said knowledge and wisdom are not to be separated from life. These means, thus verily inseparable from life in some form or the other, unveil the latent treasures of supreme knowledge and wisdom, the very solutions of life's problems, and the mysteries of life, nay of the very Existence.

Here one thing which I mean to point out is that the Philosophical Religion, being based upon supreme knowledge and wisdom, though chiefly takes revelations as the highest means for their manifestation, does by no means fail to recognize all the other means, and their help inasmuch as the different means are the different life's processes of

unveiling the latent knowledge and wisdom. Even the very ancient philosophical religionists, the sages who had the power of unfoldment through revelations, the selfless seers such as *Goutama* the good, *Kanada* the noble, *Patanjali* the magnanimous, *Kapila* the wise, *Jaimini* the virtuous and *Vyasa* the great, and scores of similar sages had the unfoldment of the latent knowledge and wisdom not simply through the common general means nor simply through the mystical means of revelations, but through both the common or general means and the mystical revelations. The final end of wisdom, manifested through the mystic means is the divine Peace or Serenity Absolute; the final goal of supreme knowledge rightly manifested through all the general means is the Absolute in divine manifestation; and the Absolute Reality is neither mere divine Serenity nor mere manifestation but

both are the Absolute Reality. Hence there cannot be perfect realization of supreme knowledge and wisdom of the Absolute Reality if only one or a few means are opened to the total and entire negligence and at the expense of all the other means. So I say that each means is to be considered, that each is to be properly studied and understood and that then alone through each its due help can be taken with right advantage for manifesting the due aspect of supreme knowledge and wisdom. In that case each means, instead of being a hindrance to one another, is a source of power to one another in the manifestation of the latent knowledge and wisdom.

I need no more dilate upon the necessity of a thorough study of the means of knowledge and wisdom, than to say that they are, as stated before, the very courses through which there is the unfoldment of

knowledge and wisdom already latently existing within the Supreme Consciousness—(I mean not simply wakeful consciousness, nor simply subconsciousness, nor simply super-consciousness, but that Supreme Consciousness to which the three-said states are the simple aspects). Now therefore I permit myself to begin with a brief survey of each of the means of knowledge and wisdom. No doubt sensuous cognition is one of the means through which knowledge manifests unto the faculty of understanding. When the senses are operated upon by some agency without, there are affections which are carried on to the faculty of sensibility. Well, as a result of the receptivity of the affections of the senses by the faculty of sensibility there is a distinctly remarkable transformation of the subject which we ordinarily call a sensation. A subjective transformation or a sensa-

## PHILOSOPHICAL RELIGION—II

tion as such is and can be a transformation to be represented as an objective quality when a distinct recognition of it takes place in the subject by the process of the manifestation of knowledge. Therefore I say that sensuous cognition is firstly a means through which the latent knowledge manifests unto us, and again it is through the process of the manifestation of knowledge that there is a recognition of having cognized, not the transformation of the subject, though in reality it is so but, the same as represented as the quality of the object. From what I have stated it becomes clear that this subjective transformation, rising as a result of the mutual operation of the subject and the object upon each other and calling forth the inherent knowledge into manifestation, is recognized, by the aid of the self-same manifested knowledge, to have been cognized not as itself, I mean,

not as the transformation but the same as represented as the so called quality of the object, and is called sensuous cognition or is also sometimes called sense perception. Sensuous cognition, as a means, being a subjective transformation and the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition being the light of the transformation as is represented as the quality of the object, do not touch and I say cannot touch the absolutely real objective contents of an object or an object-in-itself. Not even the full knowledge of the phenomenal object in its entirety can be said to be the result of sensuous cognition or through its manifestation. This knowledge or knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition is a light which in reality only enlightens us of certain relatively mutual operations and their results. Such is the means of sensuous cognition. Such is the

scope, the extent, the possibility and the limitation of the possibility of sensuous cognition. And such being the view of the Philosophical Religion, in taking advantage of the means of sensuous cognition for the manifestation of knowledge, it does not falter, it does not fail to perceive the extent of validity of such a knowledge, and therefore does not restrict its view and view-points.

Now, while going to dilate upon the next means, namely, the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition, let me draw your attention to the facts that the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition is not the knowledge of the entirety of the phenomenal object but of certain relatively mutual operations represented as particular qualities of the objects and that the possibility of the means of sensuous cognition, on the one hand depends upon the faculty of sensibility and



understanding and on the other upon certain causal conditions which are independent of, and foreign to, the said faculty. However all these foreign causal conditions which are foreign to sensibility and understanding are not foreign to the subject. Although there are some conditions which lie beyond the field of the subject, our consideration to-day in our study of the means of knowledge is not a consideration of those conditions that are entirely foreign to the subject but a consideration of the conditions that are in the sphere of the subject and which form the foundation and the material of that means namely, the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition. The aesthetic forms of intuition are the necessary requisites for the possibility of sensuous cognition as a means of knowledge. No doubt, sensations or subjective transformations, as I already stated, form the

material of sensuous cognition. Verily, a transformation is not transformed by itself nor is the transformation represented in a particular order by itself, because it cannot be that transformations can be arranged by the same transformations in the said order for the representation and comprehension of sensations as organisedly arranged qualities of a comprehended object. The representation of an object as such is not the result of a simple transformation because the transformation as the represented quality is a factor of the represented factual object. The transformation, however, being a represented factorial quality of the represented factual object and thus being the material of sensuous cognition as a means of knowledge, is dependent upon the inherent order of the subject for the representation of the said transformation as the quality of the said

object. The particular order of the said arrangement is called the form of the object. The form of the object is one of the aesthetic forms of intuition inherent in the very subject. As it is independent of a transformation and as the transformation is dependent upon the said inherent form for being represented as an orderly quality of the represented object, is independent of experience. Hence I call it a transcendental aesthetic form of intuition. It is by no means the only form inherent in the very subject for the possibility of a transformation as a transformation and for its possibility as the organised quality of the represented and extended object in time and space. There are indeed some more forms inherent in the very subject and independent of a transformation that is to be represented as the factorial factor of the fact namely the object. The representation of an object as such or the

reproduction of a representation as a concept is not possible without the representation or its concept of extension. The represented fact always means the object extended and as such extension is the necessary accompaniment of the representation of the object inasmuch as an object or even a conceptual object is inconceivable without the concept of extension. There cannot be such a thing as extension if it were not for the existence of a representation as the representation of an object caused in time and space. The factor of extension embedded in the factual object is verily related to time and space for extension is always an extension in time and space. Therefore time and space are the factors attributed to the factual fact for its possibility as an object. These factors, the causal heterogenous system of time and its co-existent factor of space are not objective conditions or

factors inherent in an object. In other words time and space are not transformations derived through experience because, firstly, experience is impossible without the already existing representations of the said time and space, and secondly, while there is every possibility for the conception of the non-existence of an experienced transformation in time and space, the conception of the non-existence of the representations of the so-called containers namely, time and space in which the contained are contained as such is impossible. So the forms, the causal heterogenous systems of time and space are the inherent forms of the subject existing as representations independent of experience. They are taken as the factors of the factual object for the possibility of the knowledge of the entirety of the represented object. In other words, the knowledge manifested through these inherent forms of the subject or the

means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition, is a necessary and essential supplement to the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition for the possibility of the full knowledge of the represented object. Or to clear myself to you, let me say that from the full knowledge of the represented object, if we deduct, all that knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition, there exists yet, a kind of knowledge as the supplement to the former which is derived through a different means—different from sensuous cognition—namely the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition. Well, what is that means, which seems so mysterious? It is the subjective nature—the aspects of which are the form and the causal heterogenous systems of time and space—which exists as such, independent of experience, for the possibility of the experienced-transformation as an

•element of a totality and for being supplemented to the element of the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition by the process of not being represented as itself—though in reality it should be so—but by the process of being represented as the factors of the factual object. As such, the knowledge manifested through the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition, being in reality the light of the subjective nature as is represented as a factor of the represented object, cannot enlighten us of the object-in-itself. However, it illumines us of the state of the subject which serves as a supplement to the light of the transformation represented as the factorial factor of a factual object. The Philosophical Religion, knowing this means as such and grasping its merit and demerit, does not limit or restrict its view or view-points.

Thus, in the manner I pointed out

before, when the knowledge is manifested through sensuous cognition and through the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition regarding the totality of the representation of an object as such, the faculty of reasoning and judgment reproduces the said knowledge. The said reproduction of the said knowledge in so far as it enters or may enter the constitution of a judgment as its element, is what we call a concept. The concept, as such or as the reproduction of the knowledge which is manifested through both the former means, being the enlightenment of only the representation, does not touch the object-in-itself. Yet, it describes and defines the transformation and the subjective nature as they are represented as the supplementary factors of the factual object, in a way so as to form in a strictly formal method the element of a judgment. The concepts then on



certain methodical and formal grounds are brought together into a particular form in order to enlarge the sphere of the already existing knowledge. This said enlargement of the sphere of the knowledge manifested through both of the former means by adding some altogether new elements of knowledge, is due to the means of inferential and comparative judgments. It is a subjective modification which, arising as a result of the formal and methodical operation of the faculty of reasoning and judgment upon the different concepts or upon the different said forms by way of the recognition of a certain identity or non-identity amongst the recognised differences between the said concepts or the said forms or by viewing a particular similarity or dissimilarity by the process of comparison between the said concepts and the said forms of different types, brings up

r manifests a certain form of knowledge in order to enlarge the sphere of the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition and the means of the transcendental esthetic forms of intuition. This means as such adds a new element to the former supplementary elements to enlarge their scope and sphere. As the enlargement is an enlargement of only those elements that reveal unto us the represented transformations and forms, this means fails to enter the existence-in-itself. Such is the view of the Philosophical Religion and as such its further outlook and progress are not checked.

In all judgments, be they simple and elementary or be they inferential and comparative, there is a concept or a set of concepts—the reproduction or the reproductions, as I stated before, of the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition and transcendental esthetic forms of

intuition—which is predicated by a different concept or a set of concepts: the reproduction or reproductions of the knowledge of altogether different transformations and forms represented as the factorial factors of the same fact or facts, or of a different fact or facts. The said predication is in some cases a predication on the ground of the recognition of a relation or relations between the two concepts in the one concept which is predicated by the other, and in some other, the predication is a predication, no doubt, on the ground of the recognition of the relation or relations between the two which is not however in the concept which is predicated by the other. Verily, the predication in the former requires nothing else but the reproduction of the knowledge of the transformations and forms represented as the factors of a factual object which is

predicated by the other, while the predication in the latter case requires something else besides the knowledge of the represented factual fact which is predicated by the other. The said something else is neither a transformation nor transcendental aesthetic form nor their result but is a form of light inherently existing in the very core of the subject. In this case it is only through this inherent light that a predication and its resultant enlargement of knowledge or the additional element of the said knowledge is possible. This invaluable inherent light—the source of the manifestation of that knowledge which is different in character and nature from the knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition and transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition—is what we call the means of subjective inherent form of light. The knowledge manifested through this means is the enlighten-

ment of only the conceptual relation or the relation between the concepts but is not the enlightenment of the object-in-itself independent of every kind of representation. Such is the means and such is its extent. The Philosophical Religion, knowing it thus and its validity as such, does not falter by blind-folding its vision to the knowledge manifested through other means.

Now, in connection with the next means namely, the means of instinctive perception, let me tell you that every subjective functional action and reaction in the form of transformation represented as the factorial factor of the factual fact, the transcendental aesthetic forms represented as different factors to supplement the former, the conceptual reproductions along with the subjective modification, the inherent form of light by which the subjective concept is predicated by the predicative concept or

by which a predication is possible as a predication in the absence of the help of the enlightenment of the other means and other abstract and widened states of consciousness experienced during the course of self-discipline either individually or collectively, leave certain kinds of impressions in the subconscious aspect of the subject. A habitual and regular recurrence of the said impression or impressions ingrain the instinct and its necessary possibilities. Owing to either external or internal or both the added circumstances, the instinctive forms changing themselves into either physical or psychic or both functions or functional activities, bring forth a peculiar kind of subjective modification which manifests its own kind of knowledge. Though its scope is very limited, it is no doubt valid in its own limits. This knowledge which is a copy of the other forms, and is

in a way different from the manifested knowledge through the other means, is manifested through that means which we call the means of instinctive perception. This means, being dependent upon impressions formed by regular habits of enlightenment of the other means which embrace only the phenomenal relations, cannot enlighten the object-in-itself or that Truth independent of every kind of representation. Such is the means of instinctive perception and as such, the Philosophical Religion grasps it. Hence, there is no scope for any hindrance in its path of progress.

Knowledge, in whichever form and aspect it may be, manifesting in non-word through any of the means, expresses itself through Word and word. Such a word or a collection of words—the expression or a series of expressions of the manifested knowledge of any one of the concrete

or abstract forms of existence—when it comes in contact with and enters consciousness, brings forth a modification which manifests a form of knowledge of the significance of the said word or words or the recognition of an understanding of the significance of the signifier. The knowledge of the significance being different from the actual significance does not touch the object-in-itself even if it happens that the significance is the knowledge of the object-in-itself. This knowledge which is different from significance is due to the means namely, the means of verbal testimony. As such, the Philosophical Religion takes it to be and hence there is no possibility for the restriction of its progress.

Then as regards the last means namely the means of mystic revelations: it is the means which is more important and more essential than any other, because those abstract



states of Existence and ultimately the Absolute-Existence or the Existence-in-itself which cannot be brought to light by any other means, are revealed unto us by the means of mystic revelations. It is the means which enlightens us of those aspects of Existence and of that Existence which are beyond the scope and the possibility of the other means. Yet it is the means which is on the one hand very much ignored and is on the other cried down and condemned as mere superstition. But let me tell you that our attitude of ignoring it and our condemnation of it display our folly and ignorance. A child in whom the faculty of reason and judgment is not developed may ignore the means of comparative and inferential judgments and may as well reject it. But then he is a child. The child's rejection or denial is no proof of its non-existence. In the same way babies amongst the cultured

may deny the means of mystic revelations, may ignorantly assert that it is a pathological conjecture or of self-deception. It is however neither a stroke nor a flash of hallucination and it verily exists in its pristine purity only to manifest unto us the supreme wisdom which is beyond the field of the knowledge manifested through all the other means. One special and specific feature of the means of mystic revelations is that it can also reveal unto us why, how and in what distinct manner the other means and the knowledge manifested through all the other means are and can be possible while the other means in manifesting out the different elements of the knowledge can by no means exactly reveal unto us their essentially true nature. Therein also lies the supremacy of the means of the mystic revelations over all the other means. In our recognition of its supremacy we have not however to close the

doors against the knowledge manifested through other means in as much as every one of the others has its distinct purpose. In the course of the means of sensuous cognition when the subjective transformation, as a result of externalization, is represented as the factorial factor of a factual object, the disciplined subjective state attentive to the represented object, as a result of the cessation of the externalizing function in the said attention, reveals the subjective transformation as only a transformation but not as the represented factor and thus gives the clue to the nature of the fact of factors. This state is the means of the first of the mystic revelations. Then, in the process of the means of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition when the said inherent forms, as a result of superimposition, are taken for the additional and supplementary factors of an object, the cultured subjective

state attending to the transformations represented as the factors of an object, as a result of the cessation of the function of superimposition due to the knowledge of transformations-in-themselves, reveals the aesthetic forms of intuition as only purely intrinsic subjective forms, but not as the represented additional factors and thus enlightens us of the right nature of the additional factors to the factors of a fact. This state is the means of the second of the mystic revelations. The means of the first and the second of the mystic revelations not only reveals the true nature of the means of sensuous cognition and that of transcendental aesthetic forms of intuition but also enlightens us of the truth of inferential and comparative judgments, instinctive perception and verbal testimony inasmuch as they are the results of the recognition of either identity or non-identity amongst the transformations

forms or of the reproductions of latent impressions or of the signi-  
 nce of the said transformations  
 forms. The knowledge of the  
 nature of the means of the  
 subjective inherent form of light is  
 easily possible by the means of  
 first and the second of the mystic  
 relations. In the process of the  
 means of the subjective inherent form  
 light, when the said inherent light,  
 consequence of the attribution of  
 said light to the elements of  
 knowledge derived through the means  
 inferential and comparative judg-  
 ments due to the inaccessibility of the  
 means of the synthesis of synthetical  
 elements in their conceptual ele-  
 ments, is erroneously taken for the  
 elements of a judgment, the  
 disciplined subjective state attending  
 the real nature of transformations  
 forms and thus transcending the  
 transformations and forms,  
 reveals the inherent form of light as

the purely inherent subjective form but not as an attributed element to a judgment. This state which thus enlightens us of the real nature of the attributed new element to the elements of a judgment is the means of the third of the mystic revelations. Even all the other means—other than the means of mystic revelations—no doubt manifest unto us the different aspects of knowledge. They however, unlike the means of mystic revelations, are incapable of throwing light on the really essential nature of their own and on the nature of the knowledge manifested through them. It is as I stated already the means of mystic revelations that rightly enlightens us of the real nature of all the means and of the different aspects of knowledge. Such is the wisdom, abstract in character, manifested through mystic revelations. Here let me beg to state that this is

not the end of the scope of mystic revelations. Aye! it is far more than this. It is the revealed wisdom that can solve the problem of problems. It is the means of mystic revelations that manifests the wisdom of the Law of the Cosmic Existence and its relation to the apparent individual existence. In the course of the study of the nature of the purely inherent and unattributed form of light, when the individuality still perceives its relation to the said inherent form of light as the owner, the disciplined Super-conscious-state, in its attention to the said relation losing the said individuality and the said inherent form of light together with their apparent relation, manifesting Itself as the pure Ego reveals Its supreme nature. This is the means of the fourth of the mystic revelations. I am now going to speak to you of one more scope and I say of the final scope of the means

of mystic revelations. It is final because it is the revelation of the glorious solution of the problem of our problems. It is after the manifestation of wisdom through the means of the final of the mystic revelations, that there exists no conflict between the manifestations of different aspects of knowledge and wisdom while the simple manifestation of the other aspects through all the other means may have the possibility of some apparent conflict with one another. It is the crown of knowledge and wisdom where from the independence, the inter-dependence and the inter-relation between the different aspects of knowledge are and can be rightly realized. In the course of the realization of the supreme Ego, when the will-to-be of the conscious and subconscious planes ceases to be with the disappearance of the limitations peculiar to each, that, wherein there is neither



aught nor naught, is the means of the final of the mystic revelations. Such is the means of mystic revelations and such is the knowledge and wisdom manifested unto us through this means.

Now I have given you a brief view of all the common and general means and of the means of mystic revelations along with the nature of each aspect of knowledge and wisdom manifested through each one of them. The common means, beginning from sensuous cognition and ending with verbal testimony, though they manifest their respectively definite aspects of knowledge, cannot however, bring unto light the true nature, the extent and the validity of themselves and of the aspects of knowledge manifested through them. The means of mystic revelations is the means of enlightenment of the Abstract, of the true nature of all the means and of the nature

of the aspects of knowledge and wisdom manifested through them. The Philosophical Religion having supreme knowledge and wisdom, having the enlightenment of the nature of the manifestation of the different aspects of the said knowledge and wisdom and having the manifested aspect of knowledge of the nature and the scope through the different means as its basis, neither falters nor errs in rightly taking advantage of the proper share which each and everyone of the means contributes. The Philosophical Religion therefore neither negates nor fails to have all the means at its disposal. It flows along with the natural flow of the manifestation of supreme knowledge and wisdom through all the bestowed natural means without being caught in the eddies of the limitations of the different means of knowledge. Its procedure is not a procedure of annihila-

tion or destruction for the establishment of a certain aspect or aspects at the expense of the others. The supreme knowledge and wisdom which embraces all this All is there and all the means for the manifestation of that knowledge are at its disposal. So the great mystery of the Existence is in the hold, nay, in the very grip of the Philosophical Religion. I have already shown you the characteristic vastness of the vision of the Philosophical Religion. It is not bound by the shackles of limitations or by the chains of superstitions. It does not, unlike creeds and systems inspire bigotry and fanaticism. It stands by and strengthens all. It observes with enthusiasm as empiricism and realism the physical features and measures and estimates with mathematical accuracy and scientific wit the material subtlety and the atomic agglomeration. It dives with its penetrating vision into

the constituents of the atom and observes the vibratory negative and positive principles with their causal conditions of the collisions and the counter-collisions of the orders of units-events in temporal succession and spatial simultaneity. It then stands by critical transcendentalism and idealism, and views the system of heterogeneous continuum, to which temporal succession and spatial simultaneity or time and space are the aspects, as an expression of individualisation of Cosmic Affirmation. It joins its hands with evolutionistic idealism and watches the process of involution and the ultimate apparent be-ness. And above all, after the recognition of this apparent be-ness as only apparent, there is the Divine-Reality or the Existence-in-itself, shining in Its infinite glory. That is Oneness, That is the Goal, That is the end of all aspirations, and Therein every progress

findeth its solace. That is the Transcendental and That is the Beyond. Ah! what can I say! That breathes breathlessly without a second. Secondless, for, there exists nothing else and ah! whatever seems to exist is only that Divine. The physical, perceived through senses exists not without that Oneness. Its reality is That and its knowledge manifested through sensuous cognition is verily that Knowledge-Absolute. The atomic agglomeration, the collisions and the counter-collisions, the orders of Units-events are existing because of that Existence. Nay, they are That, and the different aspects of knowledge, through whichever means they are manifested are verily that Absolute-Knowledge and Wisdom. The heterogeneous continuum, the inner light, the pure Ego, and the apparent be-ness exist not if it were not for that Absolute-Existence and the different aspects of knowledge of all

these exist not if it were not for that Absolute-knowledge. This all is that Divine-Oneness (सर्वं खल्विदं ब्रह्म) and this knowledge is verily that Knowledge-Absolute (प्रज्ञानं ब्रह्म). To study, to understand, to live, to realize and to be that Divine is the Philosophical Religion. To be what really is To Be, let all our actions be the actions of consecration to that Divine, let all our thoughts and feelings be united together and ever flow towards that Divine, let all our powers be the expression of that Divine Glory and let all our light and culture be the revealer of that Divine-Perfection. Nay, let this apparent life be the vehicle of that Divine Truth. And all this is the Philosophical Religion. Let this religion, the Philosophical Religion, the religion of the adepts, shine in all the planes of consciousness. Let it give manifold strength and vigour to us to build up a harmonious unity in this manifold

diversity—to build a world of peace,  
a world of harmony ! Amen !

Om !

OM!

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

*(Delivered in Dresden, Germany, 14th October, 1928.)*



OM !

SISTERS AND BROTHERS,

It is needless to say that the subject of our to-day's discourse is "Science and Religion." I fear lest this name might lead you to expect that I would give an exhaustive exposition of general science and a distinct treatise on religion or religions. That was not the idea with which the subject of our to-day's lecture had been designated as "Science and Religion" and is announced as such in bla

and white. I am myself not a gleaner of information on religions from some encyclopaedia or from a big library of books on religion. As such I am here to-day not to force heaps of indigestible information regarding religions on you. I am here to-day not to shoot out a created mass of hob-goblins at you in the name of religion. I stand here as a humble man who has been under certain disciplinary training of religion at the noble feet of one of the greatest amongst us, for realizing that Truth which religionists have always been pointing out to us in various ways. After such discipline of some years, it is when it was clear that the Truth of Religion is true, is realizable and is self-demonstrable by everyone who follows the steps of discipline and culture with the same patience, perseverance and equanimity of mind, that I began to stand and now to-day stand here before the pulpit and

desk only to explain the view and aim of religion.

Religion, the very course and procedure of human life to gain an insight into the very essence of life, is to-day condemned and is looked down upon with contempt. It has become a fashion of the day to condemn religion in the name of rigidly mechanical conceptions of the world. It is to-day supposed to be a merit to speak against religion with the so-called light of a few conceptions of science. There are and have been people who are enthusiastic, nay who are over-enthusiastic with the materialistic and rigidly mechanical conceptions of nature. In this enthusiasm there has been a transgression and there has been and is a kind of encroachment upon the Empire of freedom of the holy mother-queen of Religion. But the divine Truth of Religion is there, and who can destroy it? It is not a falsehood to be

ignored and to be condemned. Truth, however contemptuously we turn our back at it, however negligently we close our vision of it, shines and verily has to shine. A blind man is blind to the sun and an uncritical man may close his eyes to the sun, but then, the sun verily shines with all his glory. In the same way the blinded with the enthusiasm in the name of the conceptions of science, may ignore the Truth of religion, but the Truth fails not to shine. Such is the mystery of the Truth. The Truth, though ignored and neglected, in the enthusiasm of science, verily shines in Its own glory giving light to the very objects of scientific investigations. I am not a scientist. I stand here not as a scientist but as a lover of the scientific conceptions. As a lover of science, the worst homage I can pay to the conceptions of science and in a way to the sciences, is to accept everyone of their

conceptions uncritically and then have recourse to fallacious judgments that create scepticism in us, which forces us to ignore the wisdom of all ages that comes in the name of religion. Now, therefore, I take some of the scientific conceptions into consideration, critically view them and then see how far the encroachment of science-enthusiasts upon religion is justifiable.

There was a time when the atom was considered the ultimate indivisible unit of which all matter is composed. In the latter half of the last century it became clear that the atom was itself composite. The existence of the electron had to be assumed and it was possible to construct a theoretical model of the atom, a model in which there was a large "Nucleus"—of course large when compared with the electrons—like a sphere or a sun round which the small electron or electrons oscillated

or revolved like planets. The nucleus or the electron theory of the atom has been of a very great importance in helping to explain X-rays, radio-activity and most of the magnetic, electrical and optical phenomena. The atom is unimaginably small but the electron is unimaginably smaller. Assuming the electron and the atom to be spherical, the radius of an electron is  $1/100000$  of the radius of an atom.

It is claimed that an electron is the nature's unit—the ultimate indivisible unit of nature—nay of even the whole existence. Even now there are people who are quite satisfied in thinking that this nature, including all beings, is simply these material electrons. Anything said above the electrons is a fancy fairy-tale according to these materialists because science does not speak anything about it. Anything said to be known besides the electrons is a dogmatic supersti-

tion, because these materialists take the fallacious dogmas in the name of science as absolute facts. Anything—however stupid it may be—when stamped by the seal of science, is taken as a sane fact. A doctrine—however fallacious it may truly be—when said in the name and with the authority of science, is madly accepted as the true wisdom for all ages. But when a truthful man, a sage, a perfect man, a holy man, a Buddha, or a Christ whose life is the practical demonstration of what he says, whose speech flows from the very depths of truthfulness, whose clear stream of reason has not lost its way into the dreary desert sand of dead habit, whose intuitional view is able to pierce into the very mysteries of nature, reveals unto us a fact as a fact or a truth as a truth, it is rejected, nay, is cried down as a base superstition. And when a perilous falsehood is said to be declared by a

Haeckel or a Tyndal or some Dr. Hering with the stamp of science, it is and should be swallowed without any salt. Such has been, to the destruction of higher culture, the fashion of the day. This is verily a false fashion. If this fashion is simply false I have no objection. But then it is at the same time a highly repugnant and perilous growth, because it destroys uncritically the settled culture of the land and of the nations. This fashion which condemns the true facts that come in the name of Religion as superstitious fanciful dogmas uncritically reposes in truly false dogmas that come in the name of science.

Let us for instance take one of the fashions that come in the name of science. Science says that the least indivisible unit known up to this time to its observations is the electron. But then this unit is uncritically, unwisely, and I may even say,



## SCIENCE AND RELIGION

---

wrongly said to be the final truth of all truths, the final fact of all facts, the cause of all causes of the Existence. This is truly a dogma of the materialists which has not even a nucleus of verity in itself, because it has neither demonstrative evidence nor any truly logical foundation. It can be clearly seen, if we are not possessed by the demon of fashion, how the electron which is seeming to explain the physical phenomena flatly fails to explain the elementary functions of the physical body. Then what to speak of psychic organism! No doubt, with the light of the so-called electron the chemists and the physicists perhaps explain most of the magnetic, electrical, thermal, optical and as well chemical and chemico-dynamical functions of nature. But you must know that there ends not the phenomena of nature. Take the living organism in contradistinction to the unliving or

dead. There we see so many vital functions, so many other functions which physics and chemistry altogether ignore inasmuch as these functions transcend the limitations of physics and chemistry. The sciences of Biology and Physiology have advanced and are even now advancing in a way. The so-called physical unit of these sciences is the cell—the unit mass of living matter, whether rounded off by itself or associated with others to form a higher unity. The cell-problem is the special problem of modern physiology and biology. What is protoplasm? What is the extraordinary significance in the colloidal state of the protoplasmic system? In what does the cellular death consist? These are problems and mysteries that remain mysterious to the view of the material sciences. Neither the doctrine of atoms, nor the theory of electron can solve or account for the

vital phenomena of life and death. For a moment let us even drop the psychic phenomena. When a cell dies we know that the atoms, molecules and ions are still there with the energy content of the dead protein, the same as when it was living. Yet a dead cell is a dead cell in contradistinction to a living cell. No amount of materialistic electron theory can account for the diametrically distinct states of a cell—the living and the dead.

You may if you can, analyse one atom of a cell, while living or while dead; the electrons in either case vibrate in the same way, perhaps with the same groupal number and with the same velocity around the nucleus for the possibility of the atom of the cell. In either case the vibration of the electrons is there; yet a dead cell is a dead cell in contradistinction to a vital cell. How can I ignore this difference—

an ocean of difference between the vital cell and the dead one—in order to accept that an electron is the cause of all causes! If I critically view this dogma of science which perhaps takes the form of material monism, I am forced to reject the dogma as a mere superstition of science. I cannot slavishly accept a wrong dogma and I can't be diffident, I say, I need not be diffident to look for something that lies beyond the dominion of the material sciences.

Taking for granted that the vital cells are a composite of atoms which are again a composite of revolving electrons, we cannot account for the functions of the living body which is according to the cellular theory an aggregate of cells in various forms, including nervous system, ductless glands and hormones and finally the different tissues etc. In a living body there always go on continuous birth

and death of the cells. Every moment so many are being born to be vital in our bodies. What cells exist at present as vital units of the physical body are supposed to be no more existing as the vital after about seven years. Suppose I determine to do something. This is a kind of volition. Well, if the volition is the outcome of cells that exist as vital units at the present moment, this volition ceases to be as a volition after the period of the annihilation or the death of the present vital cells. But there it is possible that I may have the same kind of volition after the period. Well, if you say that that volition will be the outcome of the cells that will be existing during that period, how can they form the volitions of one experiencing conscious unity? If we take for granted that the feelings, the thoughts, the imaginations, the memory and volition are simply the

outcome of cells of a particular period, the result of all these, namely the experience of a conscious unity, should be bound to cease as an experience of a conscious unity after a lapse of a number of years after that particular period. But this is not the case. The experience is not ceasing to be an experience of a wonderful and mysterious unity of consciousness in all forms. As such most of the purely psychic phenomena cannot be explained by assuming that a cell is the final unit of all living beings including man. No amount of examination of the cells which according to the materialist's view are nothing but an aggregate of electrons, shall reveal unto us the origin of thought, nay even the nature of an impulse. Let all the living scientists hold a congregation in a living cell of a human body, and examine by visualizing the revolving electrons by any of the extraordinary

means; the cause of origin or the procedure of an impulse, remains a mystery to the overwhelming glow of science. Of course, recently one of the modern physiologists has discovered that there is a rise of a millionth part of a degree of temperature by nerve impulse. It is, no doubt, possible that a nerve impulse may raise the temperature. It is not a new discovery to say that certain emotions in the form of strong impulses will not only increase the temperature but also often alter the very conditions of the constitution. It is even by changing the mental attitudes that many of the bodily ailments are cured and can be cured. The system of driving off the inharmonious conditions of the physical body by replacing the disturbing elements of psychic state by harmonious and right mental attitudes is what is called Psycho-Therapy. The possibility of Psycho-

Therapy shows that a psychic causal condition may give rise to an effect in the physical body. So it is not a matter of wonder to me when I hear of the discovery of the rise of temperature by a millionth part of a degree by a nerve impulse. This is possible, but it does not mean that we can, from this, conclude that the rise of the same temperature shall bring forth the same nerve impulse. The conclusion that a rise in temperature will give rise to an impulse is a fallacy, because though similar causes are followed by similar effects, similar effects need not be preceded by similar causes. As an illustration let me narrate that Socrates was dead because he was poisoned by the state. Here the death was the effect and the poison was the cause. If similar effects were necessarily to be preceded by similar causes, all deaths would have been and would be due to poison given by the state. Then we



have also to assume that Kant died because he was poisoned by the state, which is nothing but an absurdity in itself. In the same way the assumption that a particular amount of heat which raises the temperature by a millionth part of a degree, when supplied to a system of nerve cells, shall bring forth nerve impulses, is an absurdity. In spite of such an absurdity, in spite of such a logical error in this assumption, there is no want of men in the materialistic school who adhere to the absurd dogma that they will in course of time create living cells and produce cellular nerve impulses by supplying electrons in the form of thermal activity in their laboratories. If such absurdities are possible or will be possible we may even try to expect large factories to manufacture wise men and also to manufacture sheep and goats and swine for the food markets of the manufactured human beings!

Here one point to which I wish to draw your attention is that some are glorifying themselves in thinking that as the death of a cell takes place by the cessation of the supply of sugar and oxygen, the cellular death means the cessation of the supply of sugar and oxygen. This is again another error, because the cells are found to be dead or dying even amidst the required amount of sugar and oxygen. It is not mere supply of oxygen and sugar that keeps the cell vital and living just as it is not mere common air that causes respiration. If it were so, a dead cell would have continued to be vital when placed in sugar and oxygen, and a dead body would have continued respiration in the open air, of course if its respiration is stopped only for want of air. So we have to know that the death of a cell consists not in the mere cessation of the supply of oxygen and sugar, but consists in the cessa-

104

tion of the inherent vital functions such as assimilation and dissimilation. Such is the difference between a living cell and a dead cell—one capable of vital functions and the other incapable of them. How can this difference come between the two cells, the living and the dead, if cells in either case are mere atoms and revolving electrons? It cannot be that electrons are transforming themselves into vital functions, and it cannot be again that electrons are transforming themselves into the cessation of vital functions. How a simple uniform unit-principle called electron which has a uniform nature in itself—if it is the ultimate as is declared by the school of materialism—can cause and also cannot cause the vital functions in a living cell and a dead one respectively, is a problem that remains problematical to the school of materialism so long as it sticks to its dogmas and becomes

reluctant to hear or to understand the facts that transcend its limitations.

Again taking for granted the possibility of an absurdity that simple electrons can account for both, the life and the death of a cell or cells, let us see if a cell or an aggregate of cells can account for all the vital and the psychic functions of an intelligent being, say a man. Suppose a person is dying. The body is there with weakness and exhaustion. The different sense organs slowly begin to be disabled. The conscious functions and the volitional activities gradually begin to fade away. The expression changes. The eyes are pathetic. The subconscious functions wane—the pulsation becomes weaker, the respiration begins to cease, the heart stops to beat, and the body is there lying dead, no more to be vital, no more to be the vehicle by which the conscious unity has been able to express as an individual. Ah! it is a

106

dead body in contradistinction to a living body. No more can it send a kindly glance at us. No more a loving word can the lips whisper in our ear. Lo! it remains cold, indifferent and inspiring awe and terror. Well, what is it?—Therein are electrons still revolving round the nucleus to form themselves into atoms which again form into molecules which again in their return form themselves into cells. Many cells so formed are there still living and many still continue to live even though the person is dead. What is this?—a dead body in contradistinction to a living body which expresses not merely the mechanical functions but functions guided by an intelligent principle, guided by a wonderful, mysterious, volitional and categorical imperative, “I ought,” which is not known and cannot be known under any circumstances to the mechanical material of the scientific laboratories.

The dead body lies there, helpless, incapable of doing any corporal functions, completely devoid of all sense activity. There is not even a trace of intelligence. Not even the signs of the past volitional functions are to be found. Then what to speak of the will and its freedom ! If all these are due to the simple physiological cells, several living vital cells are still there in the dead body ; if the clear intelligence in man is simply the outcome of the molecules and atoms of a chemist, they are there in the dead body ; if the will and its free volition are simply the results of the vibrating electrons of a physicist, they are there vibrating in the dead body. Now from all these considerations it becomes clear that neither the biological cells nor the chemist's molecules and atoms, nor the physicist's electrons can be the final causes of the living and intelligent beings or the simple and ultimate causes of

108

## SCIENCE AND RELIGION

---

their free will and the volitional functions.

In a short lecture where I should be conscious of the time limit I should not enter into the details of the problems of the cells. It is enough to say, from what I have said up to this time, that matter has not solved and cannot solve the riddle of the universe, and that it is not and cannot be, as is declared by the school of material monism, the ultimate cause of all causes, the final truth of all truths. Now knowing the inability of explaining the universe or its laws by the aid of simple matter, let us try to understand with critical eye the aim and view point of science in order to find out the faint nucleus of verity from the heaps of falsities that are carelessly gathered in the name of science. The aim, so far as I can judge, is to observe the universe and to study the facts and the factors of the facts with mathematical accuracy

and thereafter to systematically generalize the different observations pertaining to the different factors of a particular fact or of different facts of the universe. The universe is the general object of observation of science or more accurately of general science. Special and particular facts of the universe are the objects of observation of special and particular branches of science. In either case, i.e. in its most general view or in its particular and special view, the objects of its inquiry are the objects as perceived by us. The objects are not, indeed, the objects-in-themselves, but are only the objects as they are represented to us by our consciousness. This being the case, the generalizations of the facts, though systematized, are valid only in the limitations that the fact of factors is the fact as is represented as such to us by our consciousness under different causal conditions. The science, some-

110



## SCIENCE AND RELIGION

---

times being overenthusiastic with the possible validity of mathematical precision and accuracy, completely forgets its limitations and begins to extend its apparent principles to the dominions beyond its limits. So the validity beyond such limits is lost in nothingness and the generalization loses thereafter its original meaning and sense. Then begins a kind of stagnation which yields place to the growth of false dogmas. Whenever the arrogance of such dogmas boastfully pretends to have solved the riddle of the universe by matter and its sole existence and whenever people carelessly delight themselves in such pretensions, the spectacle of a man holding a he-goat and another delighting himself in the attempt of milking the he-goat, presents itself to our fancy, and the rationality which looks at things with a critical eye, teaches and rightly points out that science cannot enter into the

realms of the real essence so long as it takes the objects as they appear to be, for the objects-in-themselves. The fundamental error of the views of science consists firstly in taking the apparent for the real or in the non-differentiation of the apparent from the reality or in other words in the non-apprehension of the difference between the representation and the thing-in-itself. The view based on such fundamental errors is what we call the empirical view. We may also take a cursory view of the empirical view of general sciences as an empiricist does, only with the exception that we shall not, however, lose sight of the fact that the phenomenal object is the object of observation. Suppose that here is a book which is a phenomenal object so far as I perceive it as such with my senses. It is a fact of the universe and this has many factors in itself. Its colour, say green or red,

is one factor. It is no doubt one of the several factors through which the fact of factors is a fact to me. And its taste, smell, motion or rest, its weight or mass, its extension in the space of three dimensions, and the utmost quickness of the reproduction of the ideal-units of time through which the factors continued to be factors to my consciousness, are all, as a matter of fact, the different factors through which the fact of factors is a fact to me. The particular order through which the factors are organized as the factors of a fact, is called the form of the fact. This form or more definitely the form of the fact, is not and cannot be one of the factors inherent in the fact itself, because it cannot be an inherent factor or factors through which the inherent factors are or can be factors for the possibility of the fact of factors. Hence the form of the fact, which is not in reality a factor in-

realms of the real essence so long as it takes the objects as they appear to be, for the objects-in-themselves. The fundamental error of the views of science consists firstly in taking the apparent for the real or in the non-differentiation of the apparent from the reality or in other words in the non-apprehension of the difference between the representation and the thing-in-itself. The view based on such fundamental errors is what we call the empirical view. We may also take a cursory view of the empirical view of general sciences as an empiricist does, only with the exception that we shall not, however, lose sight of the fact that the phenomenal object is the object of observation. Suppose that here is a book which is a phenomenal object so far as I perceive it as such with my senses. It is a fact of the universe and this has many factors in itself. Its colour, say green or red,

## SCIENCE AND RELIGION

---

is one factor. It is no doubt one of the several factors through which the fact of factors is a fact to me. And its taste, smell, motion or rest, its weight or mass, its extension in the space of three dimensions, and the utmost quickness of the reproduction of the ideal-units of time through which the factors continued to be factors to my consciousness, are all, as a matter of fact, the different factors through which the fact of factors is a fact to me. The particular order through which the factors are organized as the factors of a fact, is called the form of the fact. This form or more definitely the form of the fact, is not and cannot be one of the factors inherent in the fact itself, because it cannot be an inherent factor or factors through which the inherent factors are or can be factors for the possibility of the fact of factors. Hence the form of the fact, which is not in reality a factor in-

herent in the fact itself, is a factor of the subject to which the fact of factors, namely the book, is a fact. But this factor which belongs to the subject, is related to the fact as the particular order through which the factors are factors for the possibility of the fact. The form which is thus a purely relative element, is not to be taken as an absolute factor of the fact. Again the factors, such as colour, taste and smell, which are taken as the physical features of the object, are factors varying to be factors of different types, according to the condition of the subject to which the fact is the embedment of the factors, though embedded in one and the same fact. As for example the colour of the book, say red or green, which is a factor to me or to one of you, need not be and as a matter of fact is not a factor of the same type to one who is colour-blind. In the same way all others which exist as factors

of a fact are not necessarily the factors of the same type or of similar type to some others though referred to have been embedded in the same fact. What I mean to say here is that all these factors the existence of which as such depends upon the nature of the subject, are referred to be the objective factors for the possibility of the fact. Therefore colour, taste, smell etc. are not absolute, but only relative in so far as they are taken, though erroneously, as the objective determinations inherent in the fact. The so-called determination called weight which is often taken as a uniform objective factor, has truly no sense when considered as an objective factor. Suppose that a book weighs one gram and that it is put under the direct influence of the acceleration of the gravitational field of the sun which is 27.6 times greater than that of the earth. Then the book according to the earth's standard

of weight weighs 27.6 grams. But then the same book of the weight of one gram weighs only one gram even in the sun's gravitational field when it is balanced with the same weight, one gram, which is also now under the same influence. In the same way a thing weighs differently in the gravitational fields of the different stars, provided that we balance it with a weight which is under the influence of a gravitational field different from that in which the thing is weighed for comparison. But then it will be weighing the same when both the thing and the standard weight are balanced with each other in the accelerations of the same gravitational field. There are regions where the acceleration is zero when compared with the earth's gravitational constant on account of the neutralization of the accelerations of the gravitations of the different heavenly bodies. There, our book weighs

116



nothing or its weight is zero when compared with the earth's standard weight which is in the acceleration of the earth's gravitational field. But then the book and the standard weight, say one gram, which exactly balance each other under the influence of the earth's gravitational constant, are and will be balancing each other exactly as before even in the regions where the acceleration constant is zero. The weight therefore is to be taken only as an element relatively existing or seeming to exist as a factor according to the observer's standpoint of observation. Therefore there is nothing like absolute weight existing independent of the observer or his standpoint as an objective factor of the fact or facts of observation.

Again that an object is at rest or in motion and that therefore rest and motion are the objective factors of an objective fact we are often apt to

think. But rest and motion are factors not depending upon the facts themselves, but upon the observer's standpoint of observation of the fact. Suppose that I am stationed on a so-called uniform or translating fact, or in other words, on a system of factors, or that the fact or system of factors is fixed on me who is uniformly moving with respect to something which is stationary or more accurately, which seems to be stationary, and make observations strictly confining myself to the fact of factors. Then I seem to be perfectly at rest as far as I am concerned with respect to the system and the system is equally at rest as far as it is concerned with respect to me. We, the system and myself, are therefore motionless or at rest with respect to each other. Again suppose that the fact falls out of me who is moving with a uniformly moving system with respect to something, and that I observe the fact,

118

strictly confining my observations only to the fact. I along with the so-called moving system seem to be stationary, and our fact which falls out of me and which is stationary with respect to the system on which it is lying when fallen out, seems to be moving as far as we are concerned with respect to each other. In nature there is no fact, the inherent objective factor of which is absolute rest. If it were not so, there would have been a possibility for the facts having motion or absolute motion as their objective factors in respect to the fact the objective factor of which is absolute rest. What I mean to say is, that therefore there is nothing like the factors of motion and rest which are inherent as objective factors of the objective fact. They are factors based upon the observer's standpoint of view and the nature of his observations of different facts in respect to each other. In a similar

manner, the capability of motion called kinetic energy, which is a factor of our observation of the fact of factors, is not the objective factor inherent in the objective fact itself but is a factor which entirely depends upon the point of view, and the view will be the same whether the fact is moving by the observer or the observer is moving by the fact. If the observer is stationed on the so-called moving fact, it has no kinetic energy as far as they are concerned. Again what is static to the stationary observer is kinetic to a moving observer. What is the real nature of the fact? It is one thing to one observer and quite a different thing to the other. Both are right and can be right only on the ground that they are simply factors inherent in the observer and the nature of his observation. But the moment they are taken as real objective factors inherent in the objective fact itself, they become

meaningless and absurd in themselves.

Now let me turn to the factors of simultaneity and succession and see if they are factors in the event-facts and in the objective relation of each other. As a matter of fact, what relation of event-facts seems to be simultaneous from the stationary standpoint of observation seems to be successive from a so-called moving or translating standpoint of observation. What is the definite nature of event-facts and of the objective relations of different event-facts? It is one thing from one standpoint and quite a different thing from a different standpoint of observation. If simultaneity or succession were to be a definite objective factor of event-facts or of the objective relation of different facts, there would not have been this difference of factors as we often and always experience in our observations, even

if the standpoints of observation were to be different. Hence they are not objective factors inherent either in the facts themselves or in the relation to each other. They differ as a rule according to the difference of the standpoints of observation. They are therefore subjective factors based on the points of observation of the objective facts.

From all these careful considerations it becomes clear that the different factors, through which a fact is a fact of factors to our observations, are not objective factors inherent in the fact itself, but are inherent factors of the subject and its point of view. Science, as I have already said before, goes on observing this nature. After examining nature in different aspects from one standpoint or a particular aspect from different standpoints, it reduces the phenomena into matter. Thus matter in a particular form or in different forms, becomes the prin-

principal fact. Science without taking the standpoints and the effects of the change of the standpoints upon the observed facts into consideration, analyses and synthesizes, classifies and generalizes and then defines to us that matter, its so-called principal fact, is that which has mass, weight, extension etc.. All these, I mean mass, weight, extension, and the sensible qualities, are taken as the different inherent factors of matter. Thus we have been taught from the beginning of our studies in science. It takes for granted that these factors are inherent objective factors of matter. But there is never want of experimental evidence even in the field of sciences, to show that the different factors which have been erroneously considered to be definite objective factors inherent in the fact, are by no means the different objective factors inherent in the principal fact called matter. There is, as a matter of

fact, never want of testimony to show that the factors even in a particular fact, are never definite and that they are always changing according to the nature of the observer on the one hand and according to the changes of the viewpoint of the observer on the other. In spite of these it tenaciously closes its doors and turns its back against this kind of evidence, this kind of testimony, because it has the fear of being demolished for being remodelled, reformed and re-organized. As it cares more for its conceptions than for higher truth or truths, it has neglected this query whether or not these different said factors are factors actually inherent in matter as its objective factors. It could have been more befitting for science as a branch of knowledge, to make this inquiry even before it begins its march into the secret depths of nature. Such an inquiry could have not only paved out the



way to more valid generalizations, but also could have opened the view of its devotees for better understanding of the mysteries of nature and thus could have saved them from many falterings, hasty and fallacious judgments, which ultimately take up the forms of false dogmas in the name of science. Of course great thinkers amongst true scientists who know the extent and the scope of the limitations of sciences in general, are conscious of the limitations in which they have to move with their reasonings and judgments. Hence they do not push their reasonings beyond their limits and thus do not fanatically deny the existence beyond their scope. But the negligence of science to ask whether or not the factors such as mass, weight etc. are objectively inherent in the matter, encourages in a way the unthinking to proceed with their reasonings partly based upon the experimental

evidence, even into the regions beyond the limits which science carefully sets before them, and thus to deny the principle or principles that is or are independent of matter. In order to avoid such kinds of faulty and fallacious denials, we have, no doubt, made a few observations and have considered the nature of the phenomenal facts and the nature of the factors through which the facts are facts to us. As a result of our inquiry, observations and careful scrutiny of the observations we have been able to know that the principle fact called matter has no definite factors inherent in itself, that the factors are not definite even in one and the same fact, that the factors vary according to the observer and the nature of his view point, therefore that the factors are based upon the subjective principle, that the fact is a fact in virtue of the factors through which the fact can be a fact

to us, therefore that matter has no real existence, and therefore that the apparent existence of matter is and can be due to an existence that is independent of matter. It is after this scrutiny that we see that the postulate that matter is the final cause of all causes, the final truth of all existence, is a pure dogma that is devoid of sense and meaning and that the assertion, that the riddle of the universe and the solution of the mystery of the universe are entirely in the hands of matter, is not only false but also highly pretentious. And verily it becomes clear that matter has no independent and real existence, but only apparent, that the apparent cannot be the cause of the apparent or of the existence to which the apparent is an apparent, and that the real cause by which and to which the apparent is an apparent is independent of the apparent existence called matter.

Matter is simply the apparent, but not the thing-in-itself. Once again let us begin to observe it with an empirical view. Matter is said to be the composite of molecules, atoms and electrons. The last mentioned, called electrons, are supposed to be the final units of matter. Here we should not, however, forget that the supposed final units are only those of the apparent. Some of those so-called final units are said to be positive and some negative. The positive are the units-capability of maintaining an equilibrium of the vibration of a certain groupal number of the other type around themselves, while the negative are said to be the units-capability of vibration. When the units-capability of vibration and those of maintaining the vibration in a particular order are in a state of neutralization, they are said to be in a state of inertia. The electrons in their original order of neutralization

with the consequent condition of inertia are what we call atoms. Matter is the composite of atoms so formed. A reservoir of a principle which manifests or which has the tendency to manifest through a system or systems of matter in some form of work or the other is what the scientist calls energy. The final units of this energy are again said to be electrons. These electrons—the final units of energy—are supposed to be simple and elementary. They are as well declared to be alike and similar in character. If they are so, why do they evolve into different forms producing different effects? We are perhaps sometimes answered that they evolve into different forms according to the order and the arrangement of the system of matter in which they vibrate. If it were so they could not evolve into two forms in one and the same system of a particular order or different systems

of a similar order. Suppose here is a thin coil of copper wire. Electricity, a current of electrons, is allowed to flow through the coil. If we keep our hand near the wire, we, after a little while, begin to feel warmth. Now we can touch the wire, because it is not yet hot. But then after some time we cannot even touch it, because it becomes very hot. The warmth or the heat is a form of energy the units of which are the elementary electrons. Allow the current still to flow through the same copper coil. Then after some time we will see with our eyes that the coil will become at first red hot and then luminously white. If we place it in a small dark room it is illuminated by the luminous coil. This illumination is due to light which is a form of energy different from the heat energy the units of which are also said to be electrons. The current of electrons in the same system mani-

feats in two different forms. Therefore the simple system of matter with its distinct order in which the electrons vibrate cannot account for the difference of the form of energy. We cannot say that heat energy and light energy are exactly similar, because they produce two different effects. We cannot see by the help of heat energy and we cannot warm ourselves with simple light energy.

Now from what I have already said it is possible that some may think that heat energy is the state of lower density of electrons and that light energy, on the other hand, is the state of higher density of electrons. It may be that the difference in the two forms, light and heat, may therefore be inferred to be due to the differences of the densities of electrons. But the inference is not valid inasmuch as there is in nature the manifestations

of these two forms from one and the same system at one and the same time. Hence the supposed density of electrons cannot account for the difference of the different forms. Again suppose that one says that heat in a body with a temperature lower than 400 degrees Centigrade is heat energy and the heat in a body the temperature of which is 400 degrees and more is heat as well as light. Thereby we should not conclude that the energy in a lower grade, therefore in an effect of lower temperature, is heat and that the same energy in a higher grade, and therefore in an effect of higher temperature, is light. If we were to conclude so we had to assume that the temperature of the calm glow-worms that make the pasture meadows in the dark nights so beautiful and charming by their little glowing lights, is at least four times higher than the temperature of boiling



## SCIENCE AND RELIGION

---

water. Such an assumption is an absurdity in itself. Hence the difference between the two, heat and light, is not a difference of grade. Here what I mean to say is, that the difference between one form and the other form of energy is not due to the differences of grades or their densities. There are various forms of energy in this physical nature. We have heat, light, electricity, magnetism etc.. Each one of them can be transformed from one form into the other. From this we should not conclude that one form is exactly equivalent to the other inasmuch as each having a certain causal condition in itself, reproduces itself into a distinct definite effect. Of course it is not a new thing to say that every form of energy in its propagation is a kind of wave motion. So we have so many kinds of waves, heat waves, light waves, electromagnetic waves, radio waves etc..

All these forms of energy, each with its own peculiar causal condition, cannot be said to be exactly of a similar form in so far as their distinct causal conditions are reproduced into their particular effects although they are all said to be of wave motion and their ultimate units are said to be exactly similar in character and nature. Well, our principal question is, why electrons which are similar in character and nature, and are simple, and elementary, are manifesting into two different forms—different in so far as they have inherent different causal conditions to be reproduced into different effects. It is answered that the different forms of energy are different not because the ultimate units called electrons are dissimilar, but because the wave length of each of the forms is different from the wave lengths of the other forms. When asked why there is the dis-

similarity of wave lengths in order to manifest themselves into different forms of energy producing different effects, and on what does the dissimilarity of wave lengths depend when the ultimate vibrating units are simple elementary electrons, we are replied that the dissimilarity of wave lengths is due to the dissimilarity of the velocities of vibrations of the vibrating units and that the wave length is inversely proportional to the velocity of the electrons. It, therefore, becomes clear that the differences in the inherent causal conditions of the different forms of energy which are reproduced as different effects, are dependent upon the differences of the velocities of electrons. Again the differences in the velocities cannot be always attributed to the circumstances that are foreign to the electrons themselves, because we experience in nature that the wave disturbances

that proceed from the same system and that are propagated through the same medium or mediums have different wave lengths producing different effects. Hence the velocity of an electron is taken to be dependent upon its innate causal condition. Therefore the electrons, though they are taken to be similar in so far as their generic qualities are concerned, can by no means be taken to be similar in so far as the specific qualities of their innate causal conditions are concerned. Similarity of the generic qualities and the similarity or dissimilarity of the specific qualities of the electrons point out that the electrons, which are taken to be simple, elementary final units, are by no means so but on the other hand are composite and have composite structure. An electron is a collision of two orders of units-events, one to be in temporal succession and the other to be in spatial

simultaneity. An electron, as an intersection or, more accurately, as the collision of the orders of units-events of the said type, can account for the differences in the specific qualities and thus for the possibilities of its manifestation into different forms of energy, but when viewed only as a primary unit in the space of three dimensions, it cannot account for the difference in the forms of energy and the transformation of energy from a particular form into the other. Now before I proceed with something more about the orders of units-events in temporal succession and spatial simultaneity, it is better if we deal about the two forms, called time and space. A simple form inherent in an elementary idea of one's own existence or of one's self is called a moment. This moment is different from the last and the future will be also different from the present, because each idea of one's

self is different from a similar one. The natural form of the reproduction of such moments with the utmost quickness of succession is called time. Time, the system of causal heterogeneity, is in itself neither absolute nor real. The existence of the Real-Homogeneity or so-called spread of the Real in a moment is called the unit-event and the spread of the same Real in a continuous reproduction of such moments is the order of units-event in succession, while it is the form of simultaneity concomitantly inherent in the idea of one's self, which we call space. The so-called spread of the Homogeneous in the space of three dimensions is the order of the units-event in simultaneity. As time and space are the related factors with the idea of one's self, the causal heterogeneity for the distinct orders of units-events and for the units-events themselves in the Real-Homogeneity is not ab-

ite. Hence the units-events, their distinct orders and their collision in continuum, the aspects of which time and space, are only apparent. From this kind of scrutiny of the scientific analysis and synthesis we do understand that the atoms, the collision of the orders units-events, the atoms, the molecules, that is to say the whole matter and the whole nature are not real. This nature of diversity and manyness is apparent, is Maya (माया). Since apparent cannot be the cause of itself, the dogma that matter is the real cause of existence is to be rejected. As a matter of fact, matter is not absolute, is not real. The true monogeneity, by the so-called spread which in the idea of causal heterogeneity there is a possibility of the apparent nature and the apparent existence of a denying denier, cannot be denied, because the denial becomes meaningless and absurd, if the

Reality by which the denier denies, is itself denied. Hence Homogeneity is an undeniable Existence. It is the only true Existence. This one Existence, this one Reality is uncaused, uneffected, unmanifested, undifferentiated. It is one without a second अद्वितीयं (advitiyam). There is nothing else besides that Reality, besides that Absolute Homogeneity. Whatever else seems to exist is that Reality. The whole nature, the matter, you, and I, and all are the Absolute, the secondless Brahman. But then Brahman, the godly Reality, is not what it appears to be as something else, is not what it seems to be, the all. Such a godly Reality—call it Brahman, call it the True Existence, call it the Grand Law, call it even the Father in Heavens, or call it in any way—is neither personal, nor impersonal. Such a Godly Reality is neither Being nor Non-being. Such is the God, such is the Divine.



When I say "God", perhaps some of you may think that I am forcing a big personal Ruler, a gigantic Monarch, sitting on a golden throne. Such a being is no doubt an undesirable thing to the republican citizens. But then I speak of the Godly Reality, of the necessary Divine Homogeneity. "That" I prefer to call it, because speaking of it in any form of gender may bring up the idea in you of a personal being or an impersonal being to rule you or to rule me. "That" is not a ruler, "That" is not to watch you or your deeds, to offer you just rewards and punishment. "That" is not to rule you because you are "That". तत्त्वमसि (Tatwamasi) "Thou art That". "That" is not to watch me because I am "That". अहं ब्रह्मास्मि (Aham Brahmasmi) "I am Brahman". "Such is the wonderful truth. Such is the truth declared by the sages of India. Such is the final truth pointed out by

the great teachers in every part of the world.

Verily, my sisters and brothers, that Absolute is not limited to a particular temple or to a special church, to a caste or creed, to a particular race or nationality, to a certain doctrine or dogma. That is the All. The All is That. The true understanding that the Reality as the true essence of you, of me, and of the whole apparent nature, is Religion. The process of knowing the Divine Godliness in man and in nature is Religion. The manifestation of the Divine Essence and Reality in one's self is Religion. The true realization of Godly Oneness in all through the clear stream of knowledge, through all our selfless actions, through pure and noble love, through the education and discipline of the psychic phenomena is Religion. To build up and create a harmonious world through understanding and reali-

zation of the Godly Oneness is Religion.

Let us wake up that Religion. Let us create that song of realization in us. Therein lies culture, therein lies harmony. Therein lies peace and perfection! Amen!

Om!

OM !

## TRANSCENDENCE

The Realization of The Absolute

*(Delivered in Oberhaslich bei Dippoldiswalde,  
Germany, Summer, 1929.)*

OM!

SISTERS AND BROTHERS,

The one problem that was again and again solved and that again remained problematical to every fresh seeker, the problem that had baffled again and again the rational curiosity and that had again soothed and consoled the earnest devotee's devotion, the problem that had again and again humbled down the proud exact-measurer, and that had again elevated the ardent and sincere consecration, to the very peace

and perfection, is the problem that stands before us as the problem of problems. It is the problem, the solution of which is mysteriously complicated, not because the wise want to make it so, but because this grand and sublime Existence of which the problem is a problem in every age, in every clime, is indeed unspeakably complicated and chokingly mysterious. I say that the problem is mysterious, because its solution verily embraces the Infinite, the Absolute. We may project our telescopic vision far off into the interstellar spaces, we may project our mental view far far off beyond unimaginable distances, but then the Existence extends unlimitedly further on beyond the view. And where is the end and where is the beginning?—We may pierce into the unimaginably small our microscopic view which may display the small, pointing out the possibilities of the smaller than the

## TRANSCENDENCE

---

small where our view shrinks back, where even the idea of smallness fails to depict the smallness; even there shines the same Absolute in Its unfalsified form and glory. Truly, a problem, the solution of which embraces such a grand and sublime Existence, can be rightly said to be the problem of problems. It is no new problem which confronts us only. It is as ancient as the history of mankind. Even in those far off ages, the traces of which are unknown to history, and about which tradition hardly gives any clue, the problem was problematical to the earnest seekers, and its solution was a solace to the calm sages. Call it a problem of religion or that of philosophy. Call it a problem of science or that of any other branch of knowledge. It indeed remains the same and it affects neither the problem nor its solution, because the solution embraces the all, because it

covers up all these all. Hence the wise, the great Masters, the great moulders of mankind who had lived up to what they ministered unto us told us "Look with thy senses, collect the data by understanding, analyse, synthesise, and generalise the data by reason, study the generalisations with criticism, examine with thorough discrimination how far the generalisations are in agreement with the actual, the perceptual with the conceptual, transcend the state of disagreement, enter the field of agreement with religious fervour and devotion, and thus by supreme ecstasy, trance and self-absorption realise the solution, the greatest mystery of mysteries". That is the way to the solution of the problem, the problem of problems. That is the way, the only way to right wisdom. For because of this, because of the fact that one method of enquiry supplements the other until at last

150



the Absolute Existence, the very foundation of all knowledge, is realised as the very substratum of consciousness within, the solution of the greatest problem is known. If it were not so, you might have belief, you might have argument, you might have reason, you might have reasonable probability, but you could not have knowledge.

Without a kind of true unity between science and metaphysics and philosophy and religion, true knowledge and wisdom is not possible. It was a kind of false superstition that had thrown the unity and the supplementary nature of each other out of sight and consideration. This superstition which has been working more in the scholastic markets and academical shops than in other places, has spread the veils of darkness and has made the progress towards perfect knowledge and wisdom an impossibility. In every branch,

in every form of enquiry they have created strong fences that fence the view. And lo! in these fences the seekers wander with blindfold vision, with a vision altogether restricted to short limitations to heap up heaps of rubbish and thus leave off the central point, the problem of problems. Such is and has been the blunder of the superstition. It has influenced both the dexterous artificer and the exact-measurer, both the speculative metaphysicist and the critical philosopher to such an extent that each instead of entering each other's dominions for enlarging the scope and the extent in order to know the mysteries of this sublime and grand Existence, bolt themselves in air-tight compartments in such a way and to such an extent that their ultimate progress is forever stunted in growth whatever may be the nature of the view that pervades itself in itself. There are some artif-

icers who are very efficient in their dexterity, but who being possessed by the academic superstition, never dare to enter the fields beyond their limits. Thus the growth is verily stunted and the dexterity is not carried even a little more than brute instincts. Again there are men who can measure and calculate with wonderful exactness and precision and then define things as they seem to be as things as such, but who with indifference close their eyes to the view of careful criticism of the exact data of their experience. The indifference with which the view is closed and thus the very channels of progress are shut, is not ingrained in their nature or in that of their original enquiry. It is a matter of pity to see and to say that they are trained to indifference that destroys the very centre of the idea of the enquiry. What is it that debars these men of endowments from the

essence of knowledge and wisdom? Ah! in many cases it is superstition! Again I say that there are men who are up and doing, who transcending the limits of common experience fly into the refined dungeons of reasoning and speculation, and there in their whirling march of imagined impossibilities and conjectural possibilities, put an end to the progress, lose their sight and miss the way and the aim. Thus and in many ways the mischievous play of this false superstition has led and is leading astray the sincerely longing hearts and fair intellects. Therefore it is not only a piece of sagacity, but also a matter of duty to be on guard lest this superstition might over-run and put forth screens to hinder and restrict the view. No doubt some superstitions are blessings in disguise. There are again some others which, though not of any special worth and value are

harmless inasmuch as they are often easily overcome. But then, the superstition of which I have been speaking, is a great hindrance and is difficult to overcome, because it comes to the seekers, not as a consequence of the enquiry, but as a result of giving too much importance to the academical authority. Once more let me restate that it is against this kind of superstition that the seekers are to be on their guard in order to recognise how each form of enquiry or each view point is a supplement to the rest even though their methods of procedure may seem to be different from each other. Sometimes the unthinking may laugh at such a recognition. But permit me to say that this recognition is not incompatible with common sense. In this grand existence, in this great cosmos, each principle, be it the tiniest or be it the mightiest, fulfils each other, supplements each

other. As a matter of fact there is not even a single principle the existence of which can be said to be a non-entity in relation to the rest. It is therefore befitting for an earnest seeker, for an ardent lover of wisdom to approach any object with the right spirit of enquiry, and with the recognition of the common bond and unity between every form of enquiry. Such an approach not only makes the ruggedness of the path smooth, its crookedness straight, but also reveals unto us the mystery of the object and ultimately the mystery of the mysteries, the true solution of the problem which embraces the Absolute Existence.

If an earnest seeker approaches the object and struggles on with the right spirit of enquiry, with true and loving attitude, with a heart that is freed from the weeds of wrong superstition that may stunt the growth of the very crop of the

156

right attitude for pure enquiry and wisdom, there dawns true Revelation unto him. I say that the Revelation is not a matter of perceiving a long list of phenomenal tricks or indulging in the so-called glories of an empty pathological deception. The Revelation is indeed a matter of the subjective procedure of entering the essence not simply through demonstrative evidence, nor through simple analysis, synthesis and generalisation of the data of evidence, nor simply through the act of separation of the factors of the pure subjective light from the fact of generalisation, nor through the inferential function of pure reason of the possible existence of the transcendental Absolute, nor through simple devotion to that Absolute-Divine-Principle—not even through only self-absorption in That where subject and object are one; but a procedure which sums up all these factors in itself. What I am

going to speak to you is of the true Revelation, of that supreme wisdom, of that wisdom that embraces the solution of the problem, the problem of problems, of the wisdom of That Absolute of which the Real and the non-real, the manifested and the unmanifested, are as it were Its forms. I speak of that Revelation which embraces the all. Therein let me declare, is the factor of strict observation and that of scientific scrutiny. Therein are the elements of analysis, of synthesis and those of generalisation and those of transcendentalism. Therein are the principles of subjective luminosity and those of perfect self-absorption. Such is the Revelation of which I am going to speak to you. Such is the wisdom which the seekers have to make an enquiry of. It was as such, the sages had verily sung. That wisdom is not mere knowledge, nor mere nescience, nei-



ther mere *Vidya* nor mere *Avidya*. I say that those that have only knowledge, know not ; and those that are only in nescience know not, and they too are in darkness. They alone are the wise, the truly enlightened who verily know both the *Vidya* and the *Avidya* or in other words, the knowledge and the nescience. Hence that wisdom which embraces the solution of that great problem, the problem of problems, embraces both, and in a more elaborate sense embraces the all, including the elementary principles pertaining to any sort of enquiry into the nature of any principle—be it subjective or be it objective. But another point to which I wish to draw your attention is that that wisdom—though it embraces all these factors—is not a simple compound of all these. It embraces all these factors, yet That is beyond all.

The way to that wisdom—the

means to that wisdom—is not a way which is chalked out to-day or yesterday. It was known by the ancient Masters and it was followed by the seekers with perfect trustworthiness till the Goal was achieved. It was after sitting at the noble feet of my *Blessed Master*—one of the greatest amongst mankind, that I knew about the path. It was due to the grace of that great *Master* that it could be known that the path would lead unto the Divine wisdom. One of the merits—and I understand it to be—the greatest merit is that the path need not be different from life—I do not mean the slipshod and wreckless mode—but life of right earnestness and understanding. Verily such a life is the path itself—is the way to the Divine wisdom. Therefore even the Masters declared that the path is not different from life that is truly human but not of mere animal

nature. Hence I say that the path is the best and at the same time the most efficient because it is the most natural, of course natural to human beings who are of true human character. The path was followed even from ancient times both by the poor and the rich, both by the ascetics and by the kings and emperors. The path was followed not merely in the mountain caves and in the forest bowers. It was followed and even to-day is followed both in the calm hamlets and the busy towns. Hence it is needless to think of creating some circumstances or of waiting for some congenial conditions in order to step into the path. If there is right earnestness for enquiry, for the great and soothing solution of the problem, any circumstances may suit for stepping into the path, or the circumstances suit themselves in accordance to the depth of earnestness in order to give an impetus

to enter and to proceed along the path. Hence an excuse of circumstances is lame. Firstly what is needed is not the external condition, is not the external environment, but the depth of inner attitude, the intensity of inner desire for the wisdom. It is this that is firstly wanted, pure and passionately intense desire for the great wisdom. I say pure desire because the desire for wisdom is for only wisdom's sake and that verily has no spirit of business transactions and knows no bargain. Such a pure desire for wisdom has to possess the heart and the mind and has to, in the form of Will, be prepared to step in and walk on at all costs. This state is the first preparation for being initiated into the path.

This longing, this thirst for wisdom presents a series of the what and the how, the when, the where and the why of a thing or of an

162

object which ultimately ends in the great problem, that problem of problems. This kind of presentation and the kind of search that is to be made as a result of the presentation of the problem is on no account fashioned out by the hands of the idea of utility and that of practicality. It is here that I make a difference between a seeker and a collector of utilitarian facts and figures, the one looking for the final solution of the problem at all costs and the other looking for the utility and the practicality at all costs, the one striving for wisdom and the other running after the objects that seem to be glorifying the animal instincts, the one looking for pure culture and the other striving to roll in the mire of civilisation. In the hands of civilisation even that noble culture is a muddy pudding of nothingness! Another curious mystery is that it has no conception of right culture

and if it happens to have one, it sees neither seriousness nor worth in the idea of the culture of wisdom. It has fashioned out even its academies according to its own design and the result is that the academies not only lost the original idea with which they had been planned out but have also turned out to be obstacles to the cultural view. Hence the noble cultural progress is greatly suffering and has to suffer as long as the civilisation of this type stands at its zenith. Perhaps you may be thinking that I am altogether against every kind of civilisation and that I am poisoning the minds against civilisation. But the fact is that the path to wisdom is far from this sort of civilisation. Another point is that this kind of civilisation is not natural to life that is truly humane. It is simply a course of destruction and this we have seen in the great crisis of the present day and we may see it as long as this kind

of civilisation stands in supremacy. So what we want is not this civilisation, but a civilisation that arises as a result of pure culture, that noble culture of wisdom. We want culture, we want a civilisation that springs out in the course of culture, an art and a philosophy that take their root in the course of sincere struggle for wisdom and a science and a technique that grow as a result of cultural life—a life that is truly of human character. Such a civilisation, such arts and philosophy, such sciences and technics are by no means incompatible with the culture of wisdom. They on the other hand can be guiding hands to human progress. Let us therefore replace the rot that has its origin in the idea of selfish utility and utilitarianism by right culture and its resultants. Let there be awakening of pure desire for wisdom, let there be a presentation of the great problem, thereby to

achieve the fitness for wisdom and let there be an enquiry into the solution of that problem, the ultimate problem which, to the different narrowed-down branches of sciences remains problematical and which is bound to remain as such so long as the nature of enquiry is forced down into the barriers of these narrowed branches. With the spirit of true seekers, let there be a beginning to step into the path. And to initiate you into such a beginning let me give a clue to that path of culture.

The path, as I already told you, embraces the whole course of life, beginning from the very beginning of experience and its objects and ending with the end, namely the realization of the Absolute through super-conscious trance and self-absorption. And to make an enquiry into such a course and procedure for the realization of wisdom, let us start

166



with an object or objects in general which each and every one of us is experiencing nearly at every moment of conscious life. Such a start need not be deemed to be of onesided nature, because it will, on the one hand, take into consideration the objects and the objective determinations in relation to one another, and on the other will strive to ascertain the subject, its peculiar function in its experience or experiences of the object or objects, the factors that purely belong to it, but which are adopted as the objective qualifications and also its pure factors that are utilized as the factors of the object or objects, while estimating the objects as such in relation to one another. These considerations in the process of thorough scrutiny by analysis and differentiation, synthesis and generalization make the life a path to perfection, mould the very innate nature to the supreme view to

wisdom, to the final solution of the problem of problems.

So to begin with, I say that an object to you or to me or to any one, is an object in so far as we perceive, in so far as we experience it as such. Every object in so far as we perceive and experience is a fact to us. Suppose there is a book and I declare that it is a book. My declaration or my assertion of the existence of a book presupposes at least my experience of it and in so far it is an objective fact to me. The great universe is an object in so far as we experience and in so far as there is the possibility of an experience, and everything in this great universe is an object in so far as we perceive and experience. When the senses directly or indirectly come in contact with a principle or principles that seem to be foreign to the senses themselves, they are affected according to their individual intrinsic

168

sic natures and these different sense affections are received by a certain faculty called sensibility, as a kind of telegraphic station which receives the different sounding-electrical-functions to which our understanding faculty assigns some sense and meaning. As a result of this receptivity, as an effect of the receptive function of the faculty of sensibility, there are distinct results upon the same which are called sensations. Hence sensations may be defined as the effects produced upon the faculty of sensibility due to its receptivity of the affections. Then the understanding faculty is employed in fashioning the raw materials of sensations and the first product of such an operation, of such an employment of the understanding faculty is called experience. The instrumentality of the understanding faculty through which there is a possibility of an experience as an experience is called

sensuous intuition, while the materiality, the outcome of an experience is called an object or objects of experience or is, in other words, called a phenomenon or phenomena. Experience as such, is indeed our first instruction and in its extension and possibility, is so vast that the chain of all future generations will not be in want of new information that may be gathered in that field. But then, our knowledge is not confined only to that source, is not limited only to that instruction. Experience no doubt instructs us that an object or more accurately a phenomenal object is so. It only tells us that an object as such is an object, or, to give a concrete example, a rose is a rose. Such is the instruction of experience. But it will by no means reveal unto us that an object must be so and not otherwise in relation to itself or in relation to an object or objects other than itself. Hence all our knowledge

of generality, either of universal nature or of relative character as well as of the inward necessity which we attribute to the objects of experience, is independent of experience and is therefore only a form of subjective luminosity.

It is remarkable and indeed it is very remarkable, to note that this pure knowledge which I call a form of subjective luminosity, though it soars so high in the heights of pure understanding that experience fails even to view the path of its progress, enlarges the scope of experience to such an extent that experience itself can never dream of. Well, what is it that gives an impetus to call forth this pure knowledge? Directly it is not experience itself, though it is experience that awakens that form of psychological force, called thought, which calls forth the pure knowledge into manifestation. Thought in its comprehensive sense,

is the establishment or recognition of relations between objects of experience. Foremost amongst these relations, the foundation, in fact, of all others such as those of exclusion and inclusion, coexistence and sequence, cause and effect, means and end—are the relations of equality and inequality or, of identity and difference. It is not, as often erroneously taken, the difference between phenomena that is the primary datum of sensation. But it is the difference between the sensations that can be said to be one of the data of the difference of the materiality, the outcome of experience. As for example let me state that it is not the difference between the objective determinations of the object itself, referred to be the self same, that brings forth the sensation of blueness in one person and that of colourlessness or that of some other colour in another who is said

to be colourblind. It is not the difference in the objective qualities of the same object that can be the datum of the difference between the sensations of two persons. Is it the difference between the objective determinations of the sun that brings forth the sensation of the sun of a particular size in the morning or in the evening when it is at the horizon and that of the sun apparently of altogether a different size when it is at the zenith? If it is taken for granted that it is the difference between the objective determinations of an object that brings forth the difference between sensations, it can be equally logical to say that the sun of the morning becomes smaller in the noon and that of the noon again becomes larger in the afternoon which is no doubt an absurdity in itself. So what I mean to point out and emphasise is, that it is not the difference between the objective determinations of an

object or, more definitely of a particular object, that is and can be the data of the difference between the sensations of two different persons, referred to be the qualities of one and the same object. But then the reverse view to this understanding is commonly held by the uncritical and the result is that the recognition of the difference between the sensations is erroneously taken as the difference between the objective determinations of an object. And this again is considered to be the basis of thought. The right critical view points out on the one hand that it is not the difference between objective determinations that forms the datum of sensations, and on the other shows us that the difference or to be more definite, the recognition of the difference between sensations which forms one of the data of the phenomenal differences, is a prerequisite of thought.

It is by no means the only pre-

174



requisite of thought; there are differences other than the differences between sensations which form the prerequisites of thought. In the course of the development of an experience as an experience of an object, there is no doubt the employment of the understanding faculty in fashioning the raw materials of sensation. It is not, and I say, it cannot be that the materials are fashioned out by the self-same, or in other words, it cannot be that sensations are arranged in a particular order by themselves and are fashioned out in a particular manner for the possibility of an experience as an experience of a particular object. The said order and fashion through which the sensations are arranged and fashioned out, and which are called the form and the form of expression of an object, are the principles inherent neither in the sense affections nor in the receptivity

nor in the sensations nor in the objective determinations. They are the principles purely inherent in the subject itself and come into manifestation in the course of the employment of the understanding faculty for the possibility of an experience as an experience of an object according to the nature of the subjective view. If the view is of the nature of the idea of succession, the manifestation of the said principles is of a particular type, and if it is of that of the idea of simultaneity, their manifestation is indeed of another type. (And another fact, verily curious, is that, if the view is of the nature of inherent establishment of relation between the ideas of succession and those of simultaneity, the manifestation of the order and fashion through which the sensations are arranged and fashioned out for the possibility of an object of experience, is altogether of a type of

another kind.) Hence I say that there is a variation in their manifestations according to the view, and this accounts for the difference between the constituents of these principles that purely belong to the subject. This difference between the constituents of these purely subjective principles which are of course erroneously taken as the objective determinations of an object in the name of its actual name and form, is a difference, verily different from the difference between sensations, is another kind of prerequisite of thought.

The aforesaid difference does not complete the *summum bonum* of the prerequisites of thought, because there are differences other than the mentioned differences. The variation of the constituents of purely subjective principles, called the form and the form of expression of an object, depends upon the nature of the view, but not upon the objective

determinations. I say that there is nothing like successive or simultaneous objects. Neither succession nor simultaneity is a quality inherent in an object, or in an event as an object. Suppose there are two objects, A and B, a few meters apart from each other. If they are observed by me as a swiftly moving object with respect to A and B which are at rest with respect to each other, they seem to be successive; while if they are observed by me as stationary with respect to A and B, they are simultaneous. Hence I ask you, "What is the particular nature of the objects A and B? Are they successive or simultaneous?" What they seem to be from one view seems quite different from a different view, and hence succession and simultaneity, as I already said, are not to be taken as the objective determinations of A and B. But on the other hand they are purely subjective prin-

ciples which in the course of the view bring forth variation in the form and the form of expression of an object in different ways. Succession causes the said variation in its own way and simultaneity in a different way. One is the function of time and the other is that of space. Hence, they, as purely subjective principles, are different in nature and quality. This difference between the purely subjective principles called succession and simultaneity, which is different from the previous differences, is also a prerequisite of thought.

During the course of our observations of the natures of succession and simultaneity, the peculiar difference that exists between them, and its intrinsic quality as a prerequisite of thought, we, as a matter of course, have come across time and space. As such, it is essential to look into the very heart of these fundamentals,

not only because they are such of which succession and simultaneity are, as it were their functions, but also because they directly or indirectly infuse the very factor of difference in all the elements which as principles of difference, form the prerequisites of thought. Even diversity is in a way their outcome and I know no other than time and space which, seeming apparently so uniform, so innocent and so unconnected, launch out the very heterogeneity and difference. One point verily curious is that time and its determinations cannot be represented as an entity and as temporal determinations outside ourselves as much as space and its determinations as an entity and as spatial determinations cannot be within ourselves. And one more point is that two parts of the ever-flowing time exist successively, but not simultaneously, while two spaces as the parts of the all-embracing

## TRANSCENDENCE

---

space exist simultaneously, but never successively. These are no doubt two of the fundamental differences which are very remarkable. But then what is the nature of these differences? Are they differences persisting in time and space as objects independent of ourselves that shine as differences through experience? Or are they differences that crop up as differences in relation to each other as objects-in-themselves? In order to understand this, let us see, if time and space are objects or objective determinations that come to our understanding through experience. Here one point that I permit myself to bring to your consideration is that our experience consists in referring certain sensations to something that is foreign to the subject itself. Verily such a reference which begins at a particular time, continues for a certain period and lastly ends at a particular time, each period of time

from the beginning till the end of experience being different from each other, is and can be possible in time. Hence the representation of time exists previous to any reference for the possibility of the reference as a reference of certain sensations to something that is foreign to the subject. Again is not a reference a reference to something that is foreign to the subject decidedly in a particular part of space? Is not the location in space from which there is or there can be a reference, different from that particular location where the reference has been made? This difference between the locations in space indicates that the representation of space must be already there previous to any kind of reference of sensations as an experience of an object. The representations of time and space are therefore not derived through experience but on the other hand are the representations which



exist previous to any experience as necessary conditions for the possibility of an experience as an experience of an object.

So what I mean to say is that time and space are neither objects nor objective determinations. If it were not so, both time and space could have been done away with as we could do away with the objects of our experience from consciousness. As a matter of fact, all those that are given to us through experience, as objects of experience, can be done away with from our consciousness, while the very attempt and the act of doing away with the representation of time denies the possibility of such an attempt of doing away with the representation of time. Also all the objective existence which fills up space can be thought of to be non-existing, while the very attempt of thinking of the non-existence of space, which is filled with the objective

existence, denies the possibility of the thought of the non-existence of the representation of space. In the same manner the subjective principle which can represent the non-existence of all the objective existence, can by no means represent its own non-existence, because the very act of the denial of its existence affirms its own existence, as the denial of the existence of the representations of time and space affirm the existence of the said representations. From this it therefore becomes evident that the representations of time and space are not objects or objective determinations derived through experience, but are the necessary forms of representations existing as forms of the general conscious aspect of the subjective principle, previous to any experience for the possibility of an experience as an experience of an object. Or, briefly in other words, they are purely sub-

jective forms which exist as forms of representation independent of experience.

These representations, indeed have their very root and origin in supreme consciousness and manifest as such, I mean, as representations along with the awakening of the individuality in the sphere of ideas. Well such an awakening and rise of the individuality in the sphere of ideas is called the idea of one's own existence and a simple form inherent in a unit idea of the said individuality is called a temporal unit, or in popular language, a moment. Verily, this moment is different from the past and the future will be equally different from either that of the present or that of the past, because each simple idea of one's own individuality is different from a similar one. The form of the continuity of such temporal units by the natural reproduction of the said ideas with the utmost quickness of

succession is what we call time. Time, as such, has neither absolute nor independent existence, but only has an existence as a related factor of the idea of the said individuality. Hence, when the individuality is dropped the representation of time, as a representation ceases to exist. Hence time which is dependent and conditioned, only exists as a heterogeneous representation forming the form of supreme consciousness. Also the form of simultaneity, concomitantly inherent in the awakening and rise of the individuality in the sphere of ideas is called space. Space, as a representation like the representation of time, has neither absolute nor unconditioned existence, but has an existence as a related factor of the idea of one's own individuality. Hence the representation of space ceases to be if the individual consciousness is dropped. So space only exists as a representation forming

the related factor of supreme consciousness. In conclusion, time and space only exist as representations forming the related factors of the conscious aspect of the subjective principle.

Now from what I have stated it becomes evident that the representations of both time and space, though forms of the self-same-subject and exist as such previous to any experience for the possibility of any experience as an experience of an object, are distinctly different from each other and that this difference between them is by no means of objective character. Here one point to which I particularly draw your attention is, that the differences, as prerequisites of thought, need not be, and are not always differences between the phenomena only to be derived as differences through experience, but are differences between the very forms that purely belong to

the subject. Hence it is quite compatible with common sense, reason and, beyond all, with the very facts to say that the difference between the representations of both time and space, is purely of subjective character and form and exists as difference independent of experience. The said peculiar difference between time and space is in itself a representation and forms a prerequisite of thought.

Now let me state another remarkable point with regard to time. A temporal unit of the present that passes away enters the chain of those of the past yielding place to a distinct unit of the immediate future. Such a unit that is, is indeed different from that, that was, as well as from that that will be inasmuch as each, as a distinct expression of individuality through a distinct idea of one's own existence, influences and brings the factor of difference in the different subjective forms which exist

188

independent of experience in a way distinctly peculiar to itself. So each temporal unit has its own distinct causal function distinctly different from that of any one of the others. Hence each unit of time is different from every other. I say therefore that the representation of time is a system of causal heterogeneity, and that the difference between each unit of the heterogeneous system of time which shines as a difference independent of experience, is also one of the prerequisites of thought.

The ever-varying difference which exists between the successive units of the heterogeneous system of time is the basis of the variation of each of the purely subjective forms that are independent of experience. The representation of the said varying difference which is not derived through experience, because of the possibility of an experience as an experience of an object being directly

or indirectly dependent upon it, has the representation of causation within itself in so far as it influences and alters the very conditions of all the subjective forms that are independent of experience. As such, the view that causation is an objective determination derived through experience is by no means acceptable. If it is taken for granted that the representation of causation is an objective determination derived through experience, we are thrown into conflict with the very conditions of experience. As a matter of fact, a reference of certain sensations to something which is called an experience of some object, requires the pre-existence of a cause of such a reference and thus of an experience as an experience of an object. Hence the representation of causation is not an objective determination derived through experience. It is on the other hand a purely subjective form existing previous to

190



any experience, because the thought of the non-existence of it as a thought is of the nature of the same impossibility as the thought of the non-existence of one's self as a thought. In this representation of causation there is variation which expresses itself as the difference between cause and effect in the chain of causation. This difference which is not of objective character, but of subjective form is also a prerequisite of thought.

It has been pointed out that the various differences, that between the sensations and those between the varying principles peculiar to each of the subjective forms which exist as such independent of experience, form the prerequisites of thought. Therefore it follows that it is not the difference between the objective determinations that forms the said prerequisite as it is erroneously taken by the uncritical. As a matter of fact, if we deduct from the representations

of an object or objects all those differences between the sensations that belong to the faculty of sensibility, those between the inherent orders and fashions through which the sensations are arranged and fashioned out which are called the differences between the forms and which are purely inherent in the subject, and also all those differences between the varying principles of the representations, such as succession, simultaneity, time, space and causation that exist purely as subjective forms, independent of experience, there cannot be any difference that remains behind for being apprehended through experience as a difference between the phenomena. I say therefore that neither the determinations that purely belong to the object-in-itself, nor differences, if there can be any at all, between the said determinations can reach our understanding to shine as differences for

forming the prerequisites of thought. Hence the said prerequisites are by no means the differences between the objects-in-themselves. But on the other hand, it is the differences between the subjective transformations and forms that form the basis of thought. No doubt, it has been a common error which has its origin in nescience to take the said differences as the differences between the objects-in-themselves. But the seekers being guided by careful observations and critical study of the data of observations eliminate this error and thus grasp the true nature and essence of the differences that form the prerequisites or in other words the basis of thought. And the view of the true nature of the basis of thought is necessary in order to understand the nature of thoughts and the nature and validity of judgments that arise as a result of thoughts and particularly discursive thoughts.

While the differences or strictly speaking the apprehension and recognition of them which may be and in most cases are replaced by their reproduction in memory, are the foundations of thought, thought proper, i.e., discursive thought begins with the apprehension of identity amid the said differences, but not amid the differences supposed to be persisting in the phenomena. The phenomena are represented as different, of course, on account of the superimposition of the differences between the transformations and between the pure forms of the subject on the same and the represented are conceived as identical by an attention of the subject to the point or points of agreement amongst the said differences. But then the differences being differences between the transformations and between the purely inherent forms of the subject, but not those between the objects-in-

themselves, the conceived identity and equality are indeed those of the point or points of agreement amongst the said differences. Hence the same cannot form the attributes of the objects-in-themselves or of their determinations. As a matter of fact, from the representation of an object or objects, if the conceived identity and equality which are conceived by attending to the points of agreement amongst the differences between the subjective transformations and those between the purely inherent forms of the subject, are deducted, there remains neither equality nor identity in the objects-in-themselves which can reach the reasoning faculty through the instrumentality of the understanding faculty. Therefore the conceived equality and identity are to be taken as the attributes of the point or points of agreement amongst the differences, while those of their negation are to be taken as

the recognition of the attributes of the point or points of disagreement of the said differences between the subjective transformations and those between the forms of the subject. But then it is a common procedure which has its origin in nescience to superimpose all those conceived factors upon the objects of experience and to take them as the attributes of pure objects or of objects in relation to each other. Here it may be stated that, while the presentation of such object or objects after the said superimposition is a representation, the mental reproduction of the said representation in so far as it is or may be an element of a judgment or logical proposition is called a concept. A concept being a concept in so far as it is or may be an element of a judgment and being a reproduction of a representation, cannot embrace an object-in-itself. It is no doubt a reproduction of the

196

subjective reference of its own sensations along with its purely innate order and fashion represented as the form of an object and of the purely subjective forms, time, space and causation that exist as such independent of experience, of the recognition of the differences between the elements of each one of these subjective transformations and forms and ultimately of the conceived factors of equality and identity or of their negation. Let me say that the faculty of reasoning on the basis of the recognition of relations, forms the said concepts into judgments, and that in every judgment there is a concept or a set of concepts of which another concept or set of concepts are predicated in terms of or in relation to the former. While the concept of which some other concept is predicated is the subjective concept, the concept that predicates the said subjective concept

is called the predicative concept or the predicate. There are some judgments wherein the subjective concept will suffice in order to recognize that a predicative concept predicates of it. The relation between the two concepts is such that a simple analysis of the judgment into its component parts will be sufficient to bring up an understanding that the predicative concept by way of predication is related to the subjective concept. Such a judgment which does not demand a transcendence over the experience of an object which forms the subjective concept, in order to recognize that it is predicated by a predicative concept, is called an analytical judgment. Analytical judgments as such add nothing more than what is derived through experience. Therefore they are simply arranged reproductions of representations. And their extension and validity being only within the



limitations of experience cannot touch the true Existence or the Existence-in-itself.

Now another interesting point to which I wish to draw your attention is, that the unification of concepts into a judgment or judgments is not only on the basis of the recognition of direct relations in the concepts themselves and thus in the representations through experience, but also on a basis which exists as such independent of experience. Though this kind of basis transcends experience and its resultant judgments indeed enter the field of pure understanding where experience can no more offer any view points for testing the validity of the said resultants, it peculiarly moulds up the concepts in such a way that even the view of experience outgrows its own limits. Of course in the case of analytical judgments there is no need of transcending the basis of experience in

order to know the relation between the subjective concept and the predicative concept. There are however judgments, other than the analytical, wherein experience gives no such clue for tracing out how and in what distinct manner the subjective concept is predicated by a predicative concept. Such judgments which demand a transcendence over experience or its scope and limits in order to recognize that their subjective concepts are predicated by predicative concepts, are called synthetic judgments. The basis of these judgments, thus being independent of experience, exists as a form of luminosity inherent within ourselves. Or in other words I say that the new additional factors that are supplemented in the course of the unification of concepts into synthetic judgments, are the forms of knowledge purely inherent within ourselves.

This form of the inherent knowledge which as an additional factor makes it possible to bring together the concepts into synthetical judgments, is by no means a reproduction of the object-in-itself in the field of the intellect, because there is no such channel which leads either one of them into the other. On the other hand I say, that while the analytical judgments are the arranged reproductions of the subjective representations, the synthetical judgments are the expressions of pure subjective form of light expressed in the field of the reproductions of representations. From what I have already stated, it follows that, all, beginning from the recognition of subjective transformations and ending with the factor of pure knowledge supplemented in the course of the combination of concepts into synthetical judgments, are in reality neither expressions nor copies of an independent objective

world. But on the other hand it is said, and I say that it is rightly said, that all, beginning from the subjective transformations and ending with the said pure form of knowledge inherent in the subject, are erroneously taken as the objective world and that if the root of the said subjective transformations, forms etc. is eliminated, there exists neither an object nor an objective world. Or, to be definitely precise and clear, let me say, that there exists nothing like an independent objective world, besides the objectification of the subjective transformations, forms etc.. When I say that the objectification of the subjective transformations, forms etc. is the object or the objective world, that the said world has no real and independent existence, and that therefore the so-called existence of the objective world is only apparent, I do not mean that the subject with its transformations and forms etc. is

the true existence upon which depends the so-called existence of the apparent world. As a matter of fact, neither the transformations nor the inherent forms pertaining to the subject can be said to be of real and absolute existence, because both, the transformations and forms have their origin and therefore have their being as the related factors of the idea inherent in the self-individuality or in other words, they are the inherent factors of the idea of one's own individual existence. Also let me say that the said subject is a subject in so far as it is an embedment of the related factors and in so far as it is such in relation to an object. So, when the transformations and forms are simply of relative existence and the object or the objective world is apparent, the subject cannot be said to be the real existence. Hence it is declared to be simply an apparent existence. In conclusion let me say

that neither the subject nor the object nor their relations have a real and absolute existence.

Now, our enquiry into the solution of the problem of problems on this account already mentioned, need not be deemed to have resulted into the reduction of all into nothingness or into the view of nihilism, because an existence can be said to be apparent or to be unreal on the ground of a Real-Existence by which the apparent is an apparent or the apparent is known to be the apparent. That necessary Real-Existence by which the apparent is an apparent, is Absolute inasmuch as It is independent of the apparent and as It transcends all limitations pertaining to the subject or to the object or to their relations. That is the one and the only true Existence, and there exists nothing else besides That Existence. But then if anything else seems to exist besides That Reality,

besides That Existence, know it to be only the apparent and the Reality-Beyond, being That by which the apparent is an apparent. That is indeed the Undeniable because the denial becomes absurd and meaningless, if the Reality by which the denier denies is Itself denied. That Undeniable is the Infinite-Divine and as such it was revealed to the Masters. It is in the realization of That Divine-Oneness the sages found the solution of the problem of problems. It is revealed and it is in that Revelation the seekers can find out their Goal. Thus it is declared by the scriptures and thus it is taught by the great Masters. That Revelation, as I already said, does not end with experimental observation, scientific scrutiny, critical analysis, synthesis, generalisation and the extract of the final deductions regarding the natures of the apparent and the Reality. All these methods, no doubt, mould our

understanding and reason and prepare us for that Revelation, for the realization of that Reality and in so far as they prepare and discipline the inner attitudes in order to transcend the subjective limitations and thus to achieve the realization of that Divine-Existence, they cannot be separated from the Revelation. And in so far, they cannot be said to be different from the said Revelation. The said methods of enquiry bring forth an understanding that there exists only one Reality, that That Homogeneous Oneness is accessible neither to the transformations nor to the purely inner aesthetic forms nor to the purely inner forms of knowledge, nor to any of the subjective faculties and functions, that That Divine shines beyond the apparent all, that the realization of That Divine consists in transcending the apparent all and that the possibility of such a transcendence is by inner discipline, re-



straint of the transformations, forms etc. and thus by supreme ecstasy, trance and self-absorption. This transcendency is by no means a course of annihilation and destruction. It is indeed a course of construction, a course of supply, a course of enriching and strengthening the attitudes for that Real-Existence, a course of perfecting the said attitudes in the subconscious, conscious and superconscious planes of the subject and a course of self-absorption where the apparent ceases to be apparent.

I say that after right enquiry by thus adopting the different supplementary methods, when understanding pierces into the abstract realms of nature, when reason enlightens us about the apparent and the Reality, when the heart strikes the note of true conviction to that understanding and rational enlightenment, when the attitudes are governed,

disciplined and educated according to that enlightenment, all actions become the structures of the activities stamped with the seal of selflessness and sacrifice, the heart hymns the noble and magnanimous melodies of friendliness, compassion and love, and the speech manifests the verity of such a heart. Such an enlightenment and the resultant education and culture bring subjective equanimity, one pointed concentratedness in the inspired attitude towards That One-Divine-Reality. Such an inspired attitude is set to vibrate with all round purity and subtlety of devotion. The ceaseless continuity of that leads unto the states of transcendency, the transcendence firstly over subjective transformations, secondly over purely subjective aesthetic forms, thirdly over purely subjective forms of luminosity, fourthly over the subtle and pure I-ness and lastly over the

final where the apparent ceases to be the apparent. There, where there is no longer a where, then, when there is no longer a when, That Absolute-Reality shines in an unfalsified form and glory of Its own. Such is the end of Revelation, such is the Goal of our enquiry and pure culture. There alone lies the royal balm of dispelling darkness and doubts. There alone lies the ever soothing, the ever consoling, the ever satisfying and the ever glorious solution of the Problem of problems. Let that final Goal let that final Solution be the Divine-Right and Heritage of all ! Amen !

Om !

# ERRATA

Page No.	Line No.	Error.	Correction.
13	13	pasionate	passionate
14	15	emerland	emerald
20	24	inaccesible	inaccessible
34	23	absolute divine	Absolute Divine
36	15	one	One
67	9	impreesions	impressions
74	16	inacessibility	inaccessibility
126	15	principle	principal
140	2	itself	Itself
ix	17	out	our
„	18	creating	creativity